

## Category: Special Land Designations

### Section: Recommended Wilderness and Roadless Area Management

**PC #: 54**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should emphasize protection and management of wilderness and roadless areas.**

Sample Statement:

We commend you on developing a Proposed Action that is concise and easily understood. While we understand that your proposal is very preliminary and general in nature, there are several issues with which we disagree, or on which we believe greater emphasis should be placed. These areas include: proposed wilderness, motorized use, monitoring and enforcement, consistency between forests and the boundaries of the Great Burn proposed wilderness. Consistency. We it is particularly appropriate and necessary that the Lolo National Forest work cooperatively with the Clearwater National Forest to provide consistent management and treatment of, for example, the Great Burn proposed wilderness, parts of which exist on both Forests. Please retain the Lolo's current direction and work with the Clearwater to bring that Forest up to the Lolo's standards. (Preservation/Conservation, Missoula, MT - #439)

Sample Statement:

I am concerned about the tiny portion of land put into wilderness protection and the high amount of land allowing ATV use. (Individual, Bozeman, MT - #636)

Sample Statement:

MORE Wilderness! LESS motorized access. MORE habitat for other species, many of whom have been pushed to the limit of our borders by human encroachment on their territory. (Individual, Kalispell, MT - #410)

Sample Statement:

Every Federal land managing agency in Montana has clear conservation policies for roadless public lands-except the US Forest Service This needs to change. (Preservation/Conservation, Helena, MT - #526)

**PC #: 793**

**Public Concern: The forest service should propose more roadless areas for wilderness recommendations to protect, for future generations, the outstanding wildlands of the western Montana Planning Zone**

Sample Statement:

Please expand to fully protect all outstanding Lolo wildlands- The great burn, Sheep Mountain, Monture and Swan Range addition to Bob Marshall, Lolo Peak addition to Selway Bitterroot - Rock Creek, etc. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #212)

Sample Statement:

Another issue of great concern is the preservation and expansion of proposed wilderness or what is MA 12 management areas on the Lolo National Forest. The Lolo has one of the lowest ratios of designated wilderness to total land area of any national forest in western Montana. Many IRAs were not designated as MA 12 or proposed wilderness by the 1986 Plan. We would very much like to expand the area of those designations. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #240)

Sample Statement:

These forests comprise the largest expanse of unprotected road-less lands in the lower 48 states. They are home to the grizzly bear and vibrant elk herds, and they are pivotal to the protection of watersheds and the rare fish that depend on them. Allowing dirt bikes, snowmobiles, and other off-road vehicles into these remote natural areas would have a negative impact on their delicate ecosystems. While only 5 percent of the Lolo National Forest is currently designated as wilderness, a total of 776,000 acres, or 37 percent, of the forest remains wild and, thus, qualifies for wilderness designation. Yet, your agency's draft plan is recommending less than a third of this land for such classification. Specific areas which deserve protection as wilderness include: Great Burn, Sheep Mountain, Allan Mountain, Burdette, Bluejoint, Quigg Peak Stoney Mountain, the Sapphires, Lob Peak, Blodgett, Selway-Bitterroot, South Cabinet Mountains, Cube Iron Mountain, Cataract Creek, Monture, Swan Range, and West Fork Clearwater. Please ensure that your plan contains provisions to keep all road-less areas truly road-less. The current Lolo Forest Plan states, "there shall be no motorized use" in wild land areas. Please retain this crucial standard for the Lolo National Forest and extend it to all of the other areas mentioned above. I also request that the Sapphire Crest Trail be kept free from all off-road vehicle traffic. (Individual, Petaluma, CA - #384)

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

### Sample Statement:

These forests comprise the largest expanse of unprotected road-less lands in the lower 48 states. They are home to the grizzly bear and vibrant elk herds, and they are pivotal to the protection of watersheds and the rare fish that depend on them. Allowing dirt bikes, snowmobiles, and other off-road vehicles into these remote natural areas would have a negative impact on their delicate ecosystems. While only 5 percent of the Lolo National Forest is currently designated as wilderness, a total of 776,000 acres, or 37 percent, of the forest remains wild and, thus, qualifies for wilderness designation. Yet, your agency's draft plan is recommending less than a third of this land for such classification. Specific areas which deserve protection as wilderness include: Great Burn, Sheep Mountain, Allan Mountain, Burdette, Bluejoint, Quigg Peak, Stoney Mountain, the Sapphires, Lob Peak, Blodgett, Selway-Bitterroot, South Cabinet Mountains, Cube Iron Mountain, Cataract Creek, Monture, Swan Range, and West Fork Clearwater. Please ensure that your plan contains provisions to keep all road-less areas truly road-less. The current Lolo Forest Plan states, "there shall be no motorized use" in wild land areas. Please retain this crucial standard for the Lolo National Forest and extend it to all of the other areas mentioned above. I also request that the Sapphire Crest Trail be kept free from all off-road vehicle traffic. (Individual, Petaluma, CA - #384)

### Sample Statement:

I have lived in California for many years, but my father's family were among Montana's pioneers. He spoke often of the wild beauty that made the state so special during his boyhood in the early years of the 20th century. Much of that wilderness has been destroyed since then: if any is to be preserved for the marvel of our grandchildren's grandchildren, we must act to save it now. (Individual, Lower Lake, CA - #401)

### Sample Statement:

The forest revision plans are paying less attention to wildlife and wild lands values, and putting more emphasis on motorized recreation. I feel this is the wrong direction to go. One hundred years from now, nobody will be saying, "I wish previous generations hadn't preserved so many wild landscapes for us." Unlike most places in our country, we are in the enviable position of still having wild places to save. (Individual, Whitefish, MT - #530)

### Sample Statement:

We commend you on developing a Proposed Action that is concise and easily understood. While we understand that your proposal is very preliminary and general in nature, there are several issues with which we disagree, or on which we believe greater emphasis should be placed. These areas include: proposed wilderness, motorized use, monitoring and enforcement, consistency between forests and the boundaries of the Great Burn proposed wilderness. Wilderness. We are particularly concerned about the future of wild lands on the Lolo National Forest, and would like to see the preservation and expansion of proposed wilderness areas (currently MA12) on the Lolo. The Lolo has one of the lowest percentages of designated wilderness of any National Forest in the Region. We ask the Lolo to honor its existing commitments on MA12 and to expand its recommendations to include Stony Mountain, Sheep Mountain, Lupine/Burdette, and the Lolo Peak addition to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness. (Preservation/Conservation, Missoula, MT - #439)

## **PC #: 792**

### **Public Concern: The forest service should propose for wilderness all the areas proposed for wilderness in the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act HR 1105.**

### Sample Statement:

propose for wilderness designation all areas proposed for wilderness designation in the Northern Rockies Protection Act. (Individual, No Address - #204)

### Sample Statement:

Trails and primitive motor-free outdoor traditions (horseback and hiking) should be fully protected and maintained across the entire Bob Marshall ecosystem -- not just the present wilderness boundaries. We need one comprehensive plan that recommends wilderness and manages as non-motorized all roadless public lands adjoining the Bob Marshall-Great Bear-Scapegoat Wilderness including...on the Flathead National Forest: Swan Range, Spotted Bear River, Slippery Bill Wilderness; Trails should be fully restored in the Bunker Creek Wildlife Area....on the Lolo National Forest: (south) Swan Range, Dunham-Monture Creek,...on the Lewis and Clark and Helena National Forests - ROCKY MOUNTAIN FRONT: Silver King-Falls Creek, Renshaw, Deep Creek, Teton Headwaters, Choteau-Blackleaf, Badger Two Medicine. (Individual, Bozeman, MT - #520)

### Sample Statement:

I support all areas on the National Forest that are proposed for Wilderness Designation in the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act, H.R. 1105, which has 178 sponsors in the U.S. House of Representatives. (Business, Polebridge, MT - #145)

### Sample Statement:

We urge you to include a map and analysis in the EIS that includes the proposed designations in the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act (HR 1105). This is the only wilderness bill affecting the forests in question being actively considered by the U.S. Congress. Currently HR 1105 has 179 co-sponsors in the US. House of Representatives. (Business, Missoula, MT - #616)

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

Sample Statement:

I support the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act for managing Wilderness on the three NFs. (Individual, Darby, MT - #582)

**PC #: 804**

**Public Concern: The forest service should curtail off road vehicle use and new road building to protect the biological diversity, sustain economic values of weed free land and maintain recreational activities for everyone.**

Sample Statement:

The "no motorized use" standard should remain in the new forest plan for roadless areas and proposed wilderness. In addition, motor vehicles must be required to stay on existing, open roads and a forest-wide standard should be adopted stating as much. The Montana Native Plant Society is encouraging the Forest Service to curtail off-road vehicle use, as well as new road building "in order to protect biological diversity; sustain the economic values of weed-free land, and maintain recreational activities for everyone." We are incredibly fortunate to have these rich, functional ecosystems in our state and it is in our best interest to preserve them. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #386)

Sample Statement:

These lands [WILD, ROADLESS] must be protected and preserved in a manner that reflects the long term requirements and ultimate preservation of our remaining wildlands and wildlife heritage. (Individual, Polson, MT - #581)

**PC #: 803**

**Public Concern: The forest service should require all motorized vehicles to stay on existing open routes.**

Sample Statement:

The "no motorized use" standard should remain in the new forest plan for roadless areas and proposed wilderness. In addition, motor vehicles must be required to stay on existing, open roads and a forest-wide standard should be adopted stating as much. The Montana Native Plant Society is encouraging the Forest Service to curtail off-road vehicle use, as well as new road building "in order to protect biological diversity; sustain the economic values of weed-free land, and maintain recreational activities for everyone." We are incredibly fortunate to have these rich, functional ecosystems in our state and it is in our best interest to preserve them. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #386)

Sample Statement:

Specifically we ask you bar ORV's in all areas in the "recommended wilderness" category, adopt explicit measures to enforce restrictions against ORV's in all Wilderness Study Areas, keep the existing provision in the Lolo plan that "there shall be no motorized use" in roadless areas and proposed Wilderness, and extend that to the Bitterroot as well, and restrict motorized vehicles to roads, and off the trails, so as to protect non-motorized uses. (Individual, Baltimore, MD - #402)

**PC #: 794**

**Public Concern: The forest service should maintain or expand roadless areas and don't erode standards prohibiting motorized use in proposed wilderness and inventoried roadless areas**

Sample Statement:

We are writing in strong support of the retention and expansion of wild lands in the Lob National Forest, and to object to any erosion of current standards prohibiting motorized vehicular traffic in proposed wilderness areas and areas that are currently roadless. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #214)

Sample Statement:

We strongly support the expansion of non-motorized rules and potential wilderness designations to include at the very least the Great Burn and other roadless areas along the Bitterroot crest, the Sapphire Crest Trail and related areas; Monture and Swan Range additions to the Bob Marshall Wilderness; and the West Fork Clearwater addition to the Mission Mountain Wilderness. Please do not subject Montana's remaining best places to short-term commercial interests, to access by lazy and unappreciative thrill-seekers whose vehicles have already ravaged too much of the wild, and to continued proliferation of trophy homes and other dwellings in pristine wild places that are difficult to protect from fires in addition to removing public access for recreation. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #214)

Sample Statement:

Please maintain existing forest plan standards keeping roadless areas and proposed wilderness zones free of motorized traffic. Existing trails should be protected according to their traditional uses and not be jeopardized by motorized use. Roadless and wilderness areas are the soul of this place, and must be fully protected as such. (Individual, Missoula, MT -

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

#234)

Sample Statement:

I am writing to encourage you to protect and expand Lolo wildlands. Ideally such areas as the Great Burn, Sapphire Crest Trail, Quigg Peak, Additions to the Bob Marshall and Mission Mountain Wilderness areas as well as other pristine areas will be included. I urge you to maintain current roadless status in all areas. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #243)

Sample Statement:

As someone who uses and appreciates our wonderful wildlands in this area, I urge you to adopt the Lob Forest plan standards which keep roadless areas and proposed wilderness free of motorized traffic. I am especially interested in the east face of the Bitterroot Canyons and the Blue joint Wilderness Study Area being included in the non-motorized and recommended wilderness areas. (Individual, Florence, MT - #327)

Sample Statement:

Wilderness Recommendations and Roadless Area - I have spent almost thirty years hiking and hunting the Lupine and Burdette Creek areas and before that, hiking the Great Burn area. In my opinion, these areas offer not only solitude but also outstanding wildlife habitat and ecological plant diversity. The Great Burn area provides unique high elevation views and some historical early-settlement perspective. I never tire of the view from the head of Cache Creek, along Rhodes Peak, and the trail from Kid Lake either west or along the State line. I hope that not only these areas but also the other designated roadless areas in the current Forest Plan can continue to be managed with their present wild land management direction. I believe that the current emphasis on non-motorized use should continue in these areas and this be a standard in the revised forest plan. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #428)

Sample Statement:

Please commit to protecting all of these areas in their entirety as wild and non-motorized: Great Burn, Sheep Mountain, Burdette, Allan Mountain and Bluejoint WSA. Stony Mountain, Sapphires WSA, Quigg Peak, Lob Peak, Blodgett and east face additions to the Selway- Bitterroot Wilderness, Monture and Swan Range additions to the Bob Marshall Wilderness, West Fork Clearwater addition to the Mission Mountains Wilderness. (Individual, Helena, MT - #429)

### **PC #: 808**

**Public Concern: The forest service should establish special management areas to protect pristine watersheds and clean drinking water.**

Sample Statement:

Special Management Areas should be established to stringently protect the Forests' most pristine watersheds that provide our communities with clean drinking water. (Individual, Bozeman, MT - #577)

### **PC #: 809**

**Public Concern: The forest service should manage those areas not designated as wilderness and roadless as multiple use areas.**

Sample Statement:

I strongly feel that the 28% of the Flathead National Forest that is not already designated wilderness and roadless need to be managed for the best multiple uses and provide opportunities for all to enjoy. (Individual, Kalispell, MT - #658)

### **PC #: 810**

**Public Concern: The forest service should restore trails to the Bunker Creek Wildlife Area.**

### **PC #: 811**

**Public Concern: The forest service should keep motorize use and industrial facilities out of the Bob Marshall ecosystem.**

Sample Statement:

I am a born and raised Montanan with a very strong respect and appreciation for all wild places, especially in Montana. It is in my opinion that these lands must be preserved in the truest sense -- left as they are now (roaded or not) to maintain their purity. Their undisturbed beauty is the reason I am so drawn to them in the first place. The addition of new roads, allowance of more motorized vehicle use (ATV, snowmobile, or other), and harvesting of timber only degrade the pristine beauty of these wilder places. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #669)

Sample Statement:

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

No ORVs and no industrial facilities (oil and gas) should be located in the greater Bob Marshall wilderness ecosystem. (Individual, Bozeman, MT - #520)

Sample Statement:

No ORVs and no industrial facilities (oil and gas) should be located in the greater Bob Marshall wilderness ecosystem. Trails and primitive motor free outdoor traditions (horseback and hiking) should be fully protected and maintained across the entire Bob Marshall ecosystem --not just the present wilderness boundaries. (Individual, No Address - #958)

**PC #: 812**

**Public Concern: The forest service should manage for ecological protection, no more roads, no timber harvest, protect wildlife and manage water ways for clean water.**

Sample Statement:

I would like to see the Lolo NF (and the surrounding forests) managed for ecological protection. EX No timber harvest, no more roads built, protect all wildlife and manage the waterways in ways that keep the streams and creeks clean and free of pollutants. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #742)

**PC #: 813**

**Public Concern: The forest service should manage proposed wilderness areas like they were wilderness excluding motorized activities with exceptions for permitted activities to facilitate management activities.**

Sample Statement:

I am writing this to express my concern about the potential planning actions for Lolo National Forest. I am concerned about the Wilderness and the proposed Wilderness areas being damaged by off road vehicles even in small increments. Proposed Wilderness areas need to be managed as such, with the wildlife as priority and non-motorized recreation allowed. ORV users have plenty of other place to go. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #772)

Sample Statement:

WRR-F2-A1(We propose to retain the undeveloped, natural appearing, character of the areas recommended for wilderness, and to assure the protection of resource and social attributes. We propose to identify Opportunity Class designations for each area and to provide management direction to protect wilderness values and desired condition. Classes may be semi-primitive non-motorized, primitive or pristine.) and A2(Management direction would encourage primitive uses only, and would not allow snowmobile, other motorized, or bicycle access. Some administrative activities, such as trail maintenance and fire fighting would allow some motorized use. Reasonable access would be provided to valid pre-existing rights.)1. Manage the areas recommended for Wilderness designation like they were Wilderness (with the exception for permitted activities and recognition of the earlier discussion on Wilderness dams). (Place Based Groups, Stevensville, MT - #823)

**PC #: 814**

**Public Concern: The forest service should make travel management decisions for the Sapphire roadless area and wilderness study area.**

Sample Statement:

1. Why aren't the Sapphire roadless and Wilderness Study Act areas addressed on the Travel Management/Revision Map? These controversial areas need an access management decision in this Forest Planning effort. (Desire for non-motorized emphasis/management in these areas). (Place Based Groups, Stevensville, MT - #823)

**PC #: 796**

**Public Concern: The forest service should not recommend any more wilderness and drop the roadless area designations.**

Sample Statement:

Action WRR-F1-A1: (We propose some modification to the current forest plan recommendations for wilderness (described below) to enhance suitability for designation. Modifications may include additions and deletions based on new information or existing conditions.)NO, no more Wilderness, and there should be no roadless areas. If you were to drop the roadless area designation, we would be able to stop completely all proposed wilderness areas. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #233)

Sample Statement:

EM-F2-A1(We propose to expand the use of management-ignited fire to include wilderness and recommended wilderness areas, and increase the area where natural ignitions are managed for resource benefits.)I oppose adding more wildernesses as you suggest with this action. (Individual, Rapid City, SD - #45)

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

Sample Statement:

I feel strongly that we have all the Wilderness we need. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #814)

**PC #: 805**

**Public Concern: The forest service should manage lands south of the proposed Winston Weydemeyer under the classification: primitive and semi primitive following management descriptions detailed in 36 CFR 293.17 and 36 CFR 294.13.**

Sample Statement:

The remaining roadless lands south of the proposed Winton Weydemeyer Wilderness also deserve a high level of protection. Unfortunately, winter motorized recreation on these lands as determined by Amendment 24, Alternative 6, now preclude these lands from wilderness consideration. Winter motorized routes and play areas bisect and traverse extensive parts of these roadless lands. The Montana Wilderness Association requests that these lands be managed under two land classifications: Primitive and Semi- primitive to conserve their wildlife.1) Primitive: lands not designated as wilderness or classified as semi-primitive to be managed as described in 36 CFR 293.17. Primitive areas may allow some uses not generally allowed in Wilderness Areas, i.e. mountain biking, limited timber harvest for specific purposes as described in 36 CFR 294.13 and mineral leasing with no surface occupancy.2) Semi-Primitive: Lands not designated as wilderness or classified as Primitive to be managed as semi-primitive, non-motorized areas. Semi-primitive areas may allow winter motorized use pursuant to written agreements, limited timber harvest for specific purposes as described in 36 CFR 294.13 and mineral leasing with no surface occupancy. (Preservation/Conservation, Kalispell, MT - #430)

Sample Statement:

WRR-F3-A3:(We propose to identify ROS (Recreation Opportunity Spectrum) designations that would maintain the identified desired condition. Semi-primitive motorized areas would allow for summer-motorized use on designated routes. In the winter, semi-primitive motorized areas would host a wide variety of uses ranging from closed to open. Semi-primitive non-motorized areas and primitive areas would allow only dispersed use of the non-motorized variety but could include mechanized use such as bicycling on designated routes. Management direction would protect the roadless character of the designated area but would allow for other management to occur. This may include vegetation management to restore ecosystem integrity.) Roadless lands not recommended by the Forest Service for wilderness should be defined into one of two possibilities:1) Primitive: lands not designated as wilderness or classified as semi-primitive to be managed as described in 36 CFR 293.17. Primitive areas may allow some uses not generally allowed in Wilderness Areas, i.e. mountain biking, limited timber harvest for specific purposes as described in 36 CFR 294.13 and mineral leasing with no surface occupancy.2) Semi-Primitive: Lands not designated as wilderness or classifies ad Primitive to be managed as semi-primitive, non-motorized areas. Semi-primitive areas may allow winter motorized use pursuant to written agreements, limited timber harvest for specific purposes as described in 36 CFR 294.13 and mineral leasing with no surface occupancy. (Preservation/Conservation, Polebridge, MT - #705)

**PC #: 802**

**Public Concern: The forest service should maintain the Sapphire Crest Trail free from all off road vehicle traffic.**

Sample Statement:

These forests comprise the largest expanse of unprotected road-less lands in the lower 48 states. They are home to the grizzly bear and vibrant elk herds, and they are pivotal to the protection of watersheds and the rare fish that depend on them. Allowing dirt bikes, snowmobiles, and other off-road vehicles into these remote natural areas would have a negative impact on their delicate ecosystems. While only 5 percent of the Lolo National Forest is currently designated as wilderness, a total of 776,000 acres, or 37 percent, of the forest remains wild and, thus, qualifies for wilderness designation. Yet, your agency's draft plan is recommending less than a third of this land for such classification. Specific areas which deserve protection as wilderness include: Great Burn, Sheep Mountain, Allan Mountain, Burdette, Bluejoint, Quigg Peak Stoney Mountain, the Sapphires, Lob Peak, Blodgett, Selway-Bitterroot, South Cabinet Mountains, Cube Iron Mountain, Cataract Creek, Monture, Swan Range, and West Fork Clearwater. Please ensure that your plan contains provisions to keep all road-less areas truly road-less. The current Lolo Forest Plan states, "there shall be no motorized use" in wild land areas. Please retain this crucial standard for the Lob National Forest and extend it to all of the other areas mentioned above. I also request that the Sapphire Crest Trail be kept free from all off-road vehicle traffic. (Individual, Petaluma, CA - #384)

**PC #: 791**

**Public Concern: The forest service should retain the undeveloped, naturally appearing character of areas recommended for wilderness.**

**PC #: 807**

**Public Concern: The forest service should keep motorized use out of the Great**

## **Burn.**

Sample Statement:

I became familiar several months ago with the detrimental effects of ever increasing snow mobile use in the Great Burn. Please protect this delicate place that should have a "Wilderness" designation. Keep disruptive motorized vehicles out of the Great Burn. (Individual, No Address - #591)

## **PC #: 795**

**Public Concern: The forest service should recognize the need for boarder security when recommending wilderness, don't create situations where limited access may preclude security activities.**

Sample Statement:

Please consider Wilderness and Roadless areas. We live in a changed world since 9-11. Current and proposed Wilderness adjoining international borders- Canada For us- is no longer appropriate. Management restrictions of Wilderness precludes air surveillance and other "mechanized" access. The private land interface areas recognizes the need to manage somewhat differently where private and public lands adjoin. This same type of recognition should be granted an international border. Border status trumps all other considerations in my mind. (Individual, Kalispell, MT - #225)

## **PC #: 797**

**Public Concern: The forest service should protect existing trails according to their traditional use and prohibit motorized use when appropriate.**

Sample Statement:

I am writing to urge you to consider expanding non-motorized areas and recommend wilderness to more fully protect outstanding wildlands on the Lolo NF, including the Great Burn, Lolo Peak and additions to the Mission Mountains, Bob Marshall, and Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Areas. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #234)

Sample Statement:

Trails and primitive motor-free outdoor traditions (horseback and hiking) should be fully protected and maintained across the entire Bob Marshall ecosystem -- not just the present wilderness boundaries. We need one comprehensive plan that recommends wilderness and manages as non-motorized all roadless public lands adjoining the Bob Marshall-Great Bear-Sagegoat Wilderness including...on the Flathead National Forest: Swan Range, Spotted Bear River, Slippery Bill Wilderness; Trails should be fully restored in the Bunker Creek Wildlife Area....on the Lolo National Forest: (south) Swan Range, Dunham-Monture Creek,...on the Lewis and Clark and Helena National Forests - ROCKY MOUNTAIN FRONT: Silver King-Falls Creek, Renshaw, Deep Creek, Teton Headwaters, Choteau-Blackleaf, Badger Two Medicine. (Individual, Bozeman, MT - #520)

Sample Statement:

No ORV's and no industrial facilities (oil and gas) should be located the greater Bob Marshall wilderness ecosystem. Trails and primitive motor-free outdoor traditions (hiking and horseback) should be fully protected and maintained across the entire Bob Marshall ecosystem -- not just from the present wilderness boundaries. (Individual, Condon, MT - #567)

## **PC #: 798**

**Public Concern: The forest service should prohibit motorized and mechanized use in: 1) wilderness study areas, 2) inventoried roadless areas, 3) RARE areas, 4) unroaded areas (areas not currently inventoried but have potential for categories 1 and 2) 5) areas an 6 and 10 found on the Bitterroot Travel Management Plan**

Sample Statement:

Action AM-F1-A1: (We propose to identify areas with the highest potential for OHV motorized use. Actual changes to existing designated routes would not occur until after future site-specific project level analysis was completed.) Action AM-F2-A1: (We propose that user-built routes would not be recognized as designated routes as part of the Forest Service trail system unless they have been validated as system routes through site-specific analysis, or permitted under special-use permits.) Action AM-F2-A2: (We propose that cross-country wheeled motorized travel would continue to be prohibited.) We also recommend that the following areas remain non-motorized and non-mechanized: 1. Wilderness Study Areas. 2. Roadless Area Review and Evaluation RARE areas identified in LRMP Appendix C road less inventories. 3. Inventoried Roadless Areas. 4. Unroaded, those areas not currently inventoried that have the potential to be placed in category 1 or 2 above. 5. Areas 6 and 10 as found on the Travel Management Areas- Bitterroot Plan Revision (map) 2/23/04. \* See attachment #2 (Recreational, Hamilton, MT - #323)

Sample Statement:

As an avid hiker and photographer, I'd like to see much more wilderness areas shielded from overuse by ATV and other off-

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

road vehicle users and strengthen the FS resolve in enforcing restrictions in all Wilderness Study Areas. (Individual, McMinnville, OR - #373)

Sample Statement:

These forests comprise the largest expanse of unprotected road-less lands in the lower 48 states. They are home to the grizzly bear and vibrant elk herds, and they are pivotal to the protection of watersheds and the rare fish that depend on them. Allowing dirt bikes, snowmobiles, and other off-road vehicles into these remote natural areas would have a negative impact on their delicate ecosystems. While only 5 percent of the Lolo National Forest is currently designated as wilderness, a total of 776,000 acres, or 37 percent, of the forest remains wild and, thus, qualifies for wilderness designation. Yet, your agency's draft plan is recommending less than a third of this land for such classification. Specific areas which deserve protection as wilderness include: Great Burn, Sheep Mountain, Allan Mountain, Burdette, Bluejoint, Quigg Peak Stoney Mountain, the Sapphires, Lob Peak, Blodgett, Selway-Bitterroot, South Cabinet Mountains, Cube Iron Mountain, Cataract Creek, Monture, Swan Range, and West Fork Clearwater. Please ensure that your plan contains provisions to keep all road-less areas truly road-less. The current Lolo Forest Plan states, "there shall be no motorized use" in wild land areas. Please retain this crucial standard for the Lob National Forest and extend it to all of the other areas mentioned above. I also request that the Sapphire Crest Trail be kept free from all off-road vehicle traffic. (Individual, Petaluma, CA - #384)

### **PC #: 799**

**Public Concern: The forest service should manage proposed wilderness, roadless areas, national recreation areas, national landmarks, monuments and wild and scenic rivers under the multiple use and sustained yield mandates until congressional designation.**

Sample Statement:

With regard to wilderness areas, roadless areas, national recreation areas, natural landmarks and monuments, and wild, scenic, and recreational rivers, the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service are only authorized to delineate such areas and report such findings to Congress. Unless and until Congress actually designates such areas under applicable law, such delineations should have no effect on the multiple use and sustained yield mandates for management of public lands. (Recreational, Helena, MT - #339)

### **PC #: 800**

**Public Concern: The forest service should review all federal lands not designated as wilderness for importance to backcountry recreation and designate them as Backcountry Recreation Areas.**

Sample Statement:

We request that all "roadless" federal lands, not currently designated as Wilderness, be reviewed for their importance to back country recreationists and designated as Back Country Recreation Areas. (Recreational, Helena, MT - #339)

### **PC #: 801**

**Public Concern: The forest service should protect Western Montana wild lands (such as the Great Burn, Sapphires, Quigg Peak, Stony Mtn. And wilderness additions to the Selway Bitterroot and Bob Marshall) from off road and all terrain vehicle disturbance.**

Sample Statement:

I support absolute protection for western Montana wild lands (such as the Great Burn, the Sapphires, Quigg Peak, Stony Mountain, and wilderness additions to the Selway-Bitterroot and Bob Marshall). By this I mean protection of wilderness and roadless lands from off-road and all terrain vehicle disturbances. ORV's and ATV's are a disruption to wild animals and other forest users. We have plenty of roaded forest areas already open to ORV's and ATV's. It is critical to also have quiet, undisturbed, non-motorized trails, so that those who desire can get away from our motorized society. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #369)

Sample Statement:

I support the greatest possible protection for all of western Montana's remaining wild lands, designated wilderness and roadless areas. These lands should be protected from activities that degrade their wild qualities. (Individual, Salt Lake City, UT - #391)

Sample Statement:

I strongly support the protecting of the pristine forests-especially Montana's roadless forests such as the Great Burn, Sheep Mountain, Burdette, and other roadless areas along the crest of the Bitterroot Range, Stony Mountain Quigg Peak, and the Sapphire Crest Trail in the Rock Creek drainage, the Lolo Peak addition to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness, Cataract Creek and the Cube-Iron Mt Silcox in the South Cabinet Mountains; Monture and the Swan Range additions to the Bob Marshall Wilderness; and the West Fork Clearwater addition to the Mission Mountain Wilderness. I support these roadless areas, as do



the overwhelming majority of Americans. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #474)

**PC #: 806**

**Public Concern: The forest service should support and at the creation of the Swan Valley Winter Recreation Corridor offering snowmobiling , Nordic skiing, tobogganing and telemarking to help create a viable winter economy.**

Sample Statement:

Over the past several years, numerous groups have formed down the Swan Valley to address issues of public land use and access, wildfire management, private land development and recreation use. In the last three months, these groups have been coming together to address the valley as a whole, and we believe that the USFS has a vital role in this activity. We propose the creation of the Swan Valley Winter Recreation Corridor, a benchmark program that would involve all communities in the valley, along with federal, state and private entities. A challenge, yes, but possible with the new air of cooperation in the valley and our determination to create a viable winter economy for our depressed rural area. The proposed recreation corridor would include formally recognized winter recreation areas for snowmobilers, Nordic skiers, snowshoers, tobogganners, and telemarkers. These areas, under the auspices of the USFS or DNRC, would be maintained and promoted by the community. The crowning achievement would be a valley long multi-use trail connecting Bigfork to Seeley Lake Non-profit organizations are already in place to develop and maintain this corridor with grants and volunteer manpower. (Recreational, Bigfork, MT - #557)

**PC #: 819**

**Public Concern: The forest service should include Lolo Peak in the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

I would like to see Lolo Peak included in the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #531)

**PC #: 817**

**Public Concern: The forest service should close the Gary Look out trail to motorized use.**

Sample Statement:

I have a special interest in the Great Bear Wilderness and adjoining forest lands. I frequently hike & ski, with my wife, my children, and my grandchildren on the Garry Lookout Trail and the Quigg Peak Trail, both access routes to the Great Bear. Both of these routes should have snowmobile, motorbike, and ATV use prohibited. The Garry Lookout Trail was designated as a non-motorized trail (this trail is outside the Great Bear) by the District Ranger in 1993. The trail head was posted accordingly. This past winter (2003-2004) the trail was opened to snowmobile use. We were told that this was done because of an agreement with the Montana Wilderness Association. After researching this issue, I find that this is not true. There was no such agreement by MWA. Therefore, the Garry Lookout Trail (in the Middle Fork Flathead drainage, south of Nyack Flats) should be closed to motorized use. This trail is now heavily used by x-country skiers. (Individual, West Glacier, MT - #457)

**PC #: 815**

**Public Concern: The forest service should manage so that human activity has priority on national forest land, don't create natural wild areas.**

Sample Statement:

I believe your six proposals were too limited. A further consideration should be: National Forests are public land and should not be confused with wilderness or National Parks. Human activities should have priority on the National Forests, not an attempt to create wild natural areas. (Individual, Superior, MT - #37)

**PC #: 816**

**Public Concern: The forest service should make more ORV areas available for use.**

Sample Statement:

The Mt Chamber's huge PR push the past 8 or 10 years has increased our few resident and vacationers greatly. More areas must be made for ORV's and other vehicles. The more the national forests are closed to public use, then maybe the wilderness areas should be opened up to motorized use. (Individual, Columbia Falls, MT - #435)

**PC #: 818**

**Public Concern: The forest service should enforce laws that designate areas as non-motorized.**

Sample Statement:

None of these prohibitions of motorized use will be meaningful unless they are enforced. The Forest Service has done very poor job of enforcing the prohibition on snowmobiles in wilderness areas. (Individual, West Glacier, MT - #457)

**PC #: 820**

**Public Concern: The forest service should not have management ignited fire in the wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

I don't like Action EM-F2-A1: (We propose to expand the use of management-ignited fire to include wilderness and recommended wilderness areas, and increase the area where natural ignitions are managed for resource benefits.)because natural lightning-caused fires in wilderness areas are quite adequate without intrusive FS management-ignited fire...let nature prevail in wilderness areas. (Individual, Stevensville, MT - #660)

**PC #: 830**

**Public Concern: The forest service should not use management ignited fire in wilderness**

Sample Statement:

I don't like Action EM-F2-A1: (We propose to expand the use of management-ignited fire to include wilderness and recommended wilderness areas, and increase the area where natural ignitions are managed for resource benefits.)because natural lightning-caused fires in wilderness areas are quite adequate without intrusive FS management-ignited fire...let nature prevail in wilderness areas. (Individual, Stevensville, MT - #660)

Sample Statement:

We have always been told that the purpose of wilderness was to allow natural processes to occur yet now we learn that you want to start fires in those areas...Either the wilderness is a natural area or it is not. Let fire occur naturally or manage it totally.[Action EM-F2-A1: (We propose to expand the use of management-ignited fire to include wilderness and recommended wilderness areas, and increase the area where natural ignitions are managed for resource benefits.)] (Recreational, Columbia Falls, MT - #589)

Sample Statement:

Action EM-F2-A1: (We propose to expand the use of management-ignited fire to include wilderness and recommended wilderness areas, and increase the area where natural ignitions are managed for resource benefits.)Group Agreement: Management of Ignited fire in the Wilderness Area\*Opposed to ignitions because it makes wilderness area designation moot.\*How would the interface along wilderness area edges be protected?\*Spring burns have the potential to damage nesting, new growth, must be carefully considered.\*Suggestion to add wording that fire in wilderness should only be used around interface areas. Don't leave wording wide open to anywhere within wilderness.\*Because of fire suppression in the past, wilderness is a concern, but maybe not a priority over other managed areas. Don't want to rule out fire in wilderness. Look at breaking area into zone A,B,C, etc. for treatment.(Group consensus on this idea) (Place Based Groups, Darby, MT - #829)

**PC #: 822**

**Public Concern: The forest service should not crowd wilderness with too much management.**

Sample Statement:

Action RM-F1-A1: (Forest recreation use numbers also indicate this increasing use trend. We propose to manage this increase in use by validating or establishing Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Class (ROS) for all general forest areas and Opportunity Class (OC) designations for all proposed wilderness and special designated areas to describe desired future conditions. ROS and OC class would be assigned within management areas. This process would identify a broad array of recreation opportunities depending on the stated desired future condition.)Let's not crowd Wilderness with too much management. (Individual, Condon, MT - #312)

**PC #: 832**

**Public Concern: The forest service should allow helicopter timber harvest and chainsaw use in wilderness after a fire for salvage.**

Sample Statement:

It would also be beneficial to manage & harvest timber in Wilderness areas, (helicopter logging) there isn't much difference in a chainsaw running in the wilderness before a fire rather than during and after a major forest fire. Burning of any much needed timber is a waste and a terrible eye sore for years. Not good for outfitting and tourism!! (Individual, Conrad, MT - #722)

**PC #: 831**

**Public Concern: The forest service should allow mountain bike only on designated routes.**

Sample Statement:

Keeping all motorized access from wilderness non-road areas is vital. Additionally mountain bikes should only be allowed on designated trails and well out of the wilderness areas. Along the boundaries of wilderness areas only foot traffic for a 20 mile buffer could help make them more inaccessible to motorized or bike traffic (Individual, Clinton, MT - #605)

**PC #: 828**

**Public Concern: The forest service should not provide bear proof storage units in wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

Action EM-F6-A1 "We propose to develop consistent guidance on the three forests to eliminate or minimize human-caused food sources for bears." I strongly support the need for good food storage. However, I have had considerable discussion with the Regional leadership on the subject of installations in Wildernesses to facilitate food storage. I am not yet convinced that such structures meet the "necessary to meet minimum requirement" test. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #513)

**PC #: 826**

**Public Concern: The forest service should impose limitations on wilderness use to maintain non-degradation of wilderness character. Wilderness should be considered as a resource first.**

Sample Statement:

I present these comments from the perspective of one who values the National Forests as important public assets valuable to both present and future generations. They must be administered in accordance with the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act of 1960. In that regard your attention is directed to the last sentence in Section 2 which reads "The establishment and maintenance of areas of wilderness are consistent with the purposes and provisions of this Act" This provision is especially pertinent to your work here because you are considering direction that will effect stewardship of several Wildernesses. Taken together these two acts are the basis for the Forest Services long standing "non degradation" policy for Wilderness stewardship. The Direction coming from your planning effort must insure that the wilderness character in any part of the several Wildernesses within these National Forests will never erode. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #513)

Sample Statement:

Action RM-F2-A1 We propose to validate and/or establish management criteria tied to the seven established setting indicators, as defined by the ROS Primer and Field Guide 1990. These indicators would help prescribe actions needed to maintain experience levels and compatibility with other resource values. For Wildernesses you must always keep your non-degradation mandate foremost. You must manage recreation use so as to maintain the wilderness resource undiminished. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #513)

Sample Statement:

Action RM-F3-A1 "We propose to manage all recreation activities, including Outfitter Guide use permits, based on the land's ability to accommodate activity without unacceptable resource impacts and diminishing desired experience levels.. We would develop trigger points for early identification of deteriorating experience levels and resource conditions and a tool box of suggested management actions designed to mitigate or change these conditions. Management activities would range from educational (least restrictive), to limited-use permits (most restrictive). Line officers would select, from the toolbox, the appropriate management actions to initiate activities to reverse trend. In some places on the three forests, limiting entry and use could become reality during the planning period. I support this action provided you consider the resource of Wilderness as the dominant resource when working with designated Wildernesses. I believe use limitations will be a must in most of the Wildernesses if we are to prevent degradation of that resource. I believe the public will support such limitations if properly explained and applied. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #513)

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

Sample Statement:

Action RM-F4-A2 "We propose to increase permitted day use activities, but limit the number of permits based on existing facilities (trails and trail heads) resource capability (land's ability to handle use without degradation) and need" In Wildernesses you must be certain that the wilderness resource will not be degraded. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #513)

**PC #: 829**

**Public Concern: The forest service should provide a need assessment before existing permits are renewed, don't commit to maintaining existing allocation.**

Sample Statement:

Action RM-F4-A1 "We propose to maintain existing allocation limits where applicable (primarily the Bob Marshall Wilderness Complex), but allow flexibility to move use days to shoulder or summer seasons. Days that are in excess of those being used historically, up to the existing limit, could be reallocated to a general pool of temporary days. New Outfitters could be considered if existing outfitters do not have the resources to provide the desired services. New uses and allocation to different seasons would be determined based on need and the resource's ability to handle impacts." (underlining mine) You must not commit to maintaining existing allocation limits. There has been significant increases in O&G permit allocations since these Wildernesses were established. These increases were not supported by a valid "needs assessment". One example is the initiation of Commercial Float Trips on South Fork. The new Plan must provide for needs assessments before existing permits are renewed. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #513)

**PC #: 824**

**Public Concern: The forest service should not allow equipment in wilderness even to repair dams**

Sample Statement:

[I don't like Action] WRD-F4-A2 (Numerous privately owned dams exist within the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area in Montana, an area managed by the Bitterroot National Forest. We propose mechanized access be allowed when analysis indicates this is the most appropriate means in a given situation. Mechanized access would be accomplished in ways that minimize impacts to wilderness values.) [because]...this is a wilderness and bulldozers, etc. shouldn't be allowed to drive in. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #466)

**PC #: 823**

**Public Concern: The forest service should needs to address under funding for monitoring and enforcement.**

Sample Statement:

A wilderness area in our National Forest system remains a wilderness only if there is enforcement of regulations adopted to keep that wilderness. Presently the federal government woefully under funds the Forest Service in all areas, but especially enforcement of regulations. There needs to be adequate funding for monitoring the wilderness and enforcing forest plans. Your group should address itself to that dire need. (Individual, Trout Creek, MT - #417)

**PC #: 827**

**Public Concern: The forest service should use management ignited fires in wilderness only in rare occasions with direction supported by NEPA.**

Sample Statement:

Action EM-F2-A1 "We propose to expand the use of management-ignited fire to include wilderness and recommended wilderness areas, and increase the area where natural ignitions are managed for resource benefits." While I support the increased use of management ignited fire on non Wilderness lands this action item concerns me insofar as Wilderness is concerned. The resource of Wilderness is defined as "an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man." While natural fire is a part of nature, man ignited fire is trammeling as much as farming would be. Few land managers I know would light a fire at the time and place that nature would. I recognize there may be some instances where you may need to do some management ignitions in order to allow a natural program to happen. However, these should be rare and supported by NEPA documentation. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #513)

**PC #: 833**

**Public Concern: The forest service should actively manage the remaining roadless areas, don't lock them up as though they were wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

The next wilderness bill should include an equal amount of acreage designated as back country recreation. I say this

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

because to freeze everything where it is now would be correctly out of the question. The pro-wilderness groups want it all. When the wilderness bill was passed in 1964, I was only 12 years old. In the years that followed I was very much in favor of it. It was a good idea to have places that are wild and undeveloped. With that said, 104 million acres is a respectable number to set aside. The remaining roadless areas should be managed and not locked up. (Individual, Clinton, MT - #44)

**PC #: 825**

**Public Concern: The forest service should include general direction for wilderness stewardship in the plan and would be coordinated across the forest lines.**

Sample Statement:

[Cont. from comment 16] Action WRD-F4-A3: Numerous privately owned dams exist within the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area in Montana, an area managed by the Bitterroot National Forest. We propose use of light motorized tools, such as chainsaws, motorized drills, compressors as well as explosives, be allowed on the dam structure and impoundment for the purpose of maintaining, operating, reconstructing or breaching the dams. The Forest Service could impose reasonable restrictions on such use to reduce impacts to wilderness values. Action WRD-F4-A4: Numerous privately owned dams exist within the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area in Montana, an area managed by the Bitterroot National Forest. We propose all non-motorized equipment would be allowed on the dam structure and impoundment for the purpose of dam operation, maintenance, reconstruction or breaching. Action WRD-F4-A5: Numerous privately owned dams exist within the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area in Montana, an area managed by the Bitterroot National Forest. We propose storage of equipment be allowed when analysis indicates it is the most appropriate way to achieve operation, maintenance, reconstruction or breaching objectives. Equipment storage would be accomplished in ways that minimize impacts to wilderness values. Action WRD-F5-A1: Existing legislation for the Rattlesnake National Recreation Area and Wilderness, located on the Lolo National Forest, allows for the maintenance of dams found within the designated area. There is no need for change with respect to dam maintenance. The proposed action includes no general direction for Wilderness stewardship. Are we to assume that the forest plans will not deal with this important issue? This omission needs to be addressed, as does coordination with other national forests for wildernesses which cross forest boundaries. (Preservation/Conservation, Moscow, ID - #509)

**PC #: 821**

**Public Concern: The forest service should consider river floaters and commercial delivery separate from private use of Schaffer Meadows Airstrip or increase allowed trips by 15% and consider administrative use outside the allocation.**

Sample Statement:

Concern at Schaffer Meadows Airstrip and the LAC standards in the current plan and what user group has increased the numbers over time -- could we consider the river **flating** separately or the commercial delivery of floaters -- so the pilots using the airstrip for non-commercial purposes are within a set allocation -- can the existing allocation or annual amount be increased 15% with revision -- could all admin use #'s be outside of the allocation -- could the annual flying work weekend be exempt from the annual numbers -- could the search and rescue training flights/weekend be exempt from the annual numbers?? (Recreational, Kalispell, MT - #66)

**PC #: 491**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should designate all roadless lands of 1,000 acres as wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

I would like to see all roadless lands of 1000 acres designated wilderness. (Individual, Whitefish, MT - #574)

Sample Statement:

Open your eyes, millions of people each year come here to experience nature. I believe that every roadless acre is a precious commodity. I would like to see all roadless lands of 1000 acres designated wilderness. I realize that Rare II identified 5000 acres but some states in the east have designated less than 1000 acres because that's all the land they have. (Individual, Whitefish, MT - #622)

**PC #: 466**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should not propose/designate any more wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

I often find myself saying, why fix what ain't broke? If the management that has been used on these proposed new wilderness areas wasn't sufficient to protect it for future generations how could it qualify for the designation. The existing plan must be working for it to preserve it so well. I oppose taking any more land away from the public. The designation for Wilderness is an improper way to preserve something for future generations. The designation has been used as a tool to simply destroy areas that should be preserved through proper management practices. (Individual, Rapid City, SD - #45)

Sample Statement:

I don't want to see any recommended acreages for wilderness. The public can't use the national forests now. The no-use/no-action is a wasteful, detrimental protection ploy that succeeded but has to be changed. (Individual, Columbia Falls, MT - #435)

Sample Statement:

Wilderness designation does not allow for access, or makes it very difficult. Therefore, wilderness designation should not be increased. Roads and trails and airstrips are necessary to access the Forest and enjoy it with family and friends. Additional designation of Wilderness areas creates more problems, as it concentrates users with motors or bicyclists. Designation of additional wilderness is a net loss of areas for snowmobiles, and is not acceptable for multiple uses. Your agency can't be trusted to allow for reasonable access to pre-existing rights. (Individual, Dickinson, ND - #535)

**PC #: 497**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should re-evaluate proposed wilderness areas deleted with proposed action WRR-F1-A1, for timber production.**

Sample Statement:

Review and Discuss Proposed Wilderness Inclusions: Maps of proposed wilderness were distributed. Yellow sections indicated additions to the 1987 Forest Plan proposed wilderness. Red indicated deletions from the 1987 Forest Plan proposed wilderness. Recommendation made to pull these areas out of the base and re-evaluate for timber production based on new technologies now available. (Place Based Groups, Darby, MT - #829)

**PC #: 463**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow snowmobiling in proposed wilderness, especially the Great Burn/Hoodoo Mt. area.**

Sample Statement:

Snowmobiling has always been allowed in the great burn/hoodoo area. Degradation of the land has not occurred due to this activity, yet suddenly it must be closed to assure protection of resource. After all these years of recreation it is still being recommended as wilderness. (Individual, Clinton, MT - #34)

Sample Statement:

Snowmobiling has been a traditional use in proposed wilderness for many years. Nothing has changed in these areas to degrade the land. Winter travel means zero impact to the ground. These areas should be designated as backcountry recreation and let Congress make its decision whether or not to tie up this National Forest land as wilderness or not. The Forest Service does not have the authority to create designated wilderness. The great burn named as such because it burned to the ground...now that was impact. Snowmobiles in winter...no problem. (Individual, Clinton, MT - #34)

Sample Statement:

I don't like this action because the impact of snowmobiles leave no trace of damage to terrain, OHV are so limited to trails due to dense forest, and steep terrain and are on only a small percentage of trails due to the 100's of closures over the last several years. (Individual, Thompson Falls, MT - #220)

**PC #: 473**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should review recommended wilderness and inventoried roadless areas to be closed to motorized use, in terms of existing snowmobile and trail bike use.**

Sample Statement:

Snowmobiling in currently inventoried roadless areas has not in any way degraded the roadless character of these roadless areas or their desired condition. Snowmobiling is a valid pre-existing right that should be allowed to continue in these areas.

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

If changes are to be made in ROS designations, such designations should be semi primitive, motorized, for winter use, since snowmobiling does not cause any negative impact to the roadless character of the designated area. The Bitterroot Ridgerunners Snowmobile Club worked with the Bitterroot National Forest to develop a map showing areas of current snowmobile use. Should any inventoried roadless areas be closed to motorized use, every effort should be made by the Forest to ensure that roadless areas being closed to motorized use do not overlap with areas currently being used by snowmobilers. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #489)

### **PC #: 470**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate all national forest lands for proposed wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

I agree with the proposed changes to recommended wilderness in the Bitterroot, Flathead, and Lob National Forests. However, I would like to see an additional action included in this section addressing the need for consideration and evaluation of other areas for proposed wilderness. Adding to the wilderness core network would mitigate the effects of habitat fragmentation on species such as lynx and grizzlies by providing valuable linkages. (Individual, Bigfork, MT - #475)

Sample Statement:

We immediately need to seriously consider the designation of wilderness to all recommended areas under consideration. (Individual, Kila, MT - #550)

### **PC #: 471**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should not recommend areas along the face of the Bitterroot Mtns. as wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

I don't personally want to see any of the 1986 recommended wilderness areas along the face of the Bitterroot Mountains become wilderness, or remain in "recommended" status. I think that there will be too many conflicts and lost opportunities for recreation. The need for day use trails, etc., is only increasing as the population increases. As we increase use adjacent to these "recommended" areas, we will be exceeding the Limits of Acceptable Change and they will lose "wilderness quality", thus limiting the FS opportunity to develop more recreation sites along the face. Designate these areas as "primitive, non-road", or some other appropriate designation. I also think it is foolish to "pick" other small sites along the face to substitute as recommended wilderness. This is just an exercise in numbers (acres). Just do what needs to be done. (Individual, No Address - #92)

### **PC #: 468**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should increase the Wilderness system by recommending the maximum wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

I encourage you to manage for the maximum amount of wilderness and for natural processes to be allowed to take place wherever possible. Today we Montanans appreciate most those areas that have seen the least impact from humans. We're not applauding how many jobs were created or railroad ties were made by industrial forestry around the turn of the century. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #52)

Sample Statement:

Increase wilderness areas. (Individual, Salt Lake City, UT - #346)

Sample Statement:

You list 405,187 acres of roadless lands. Every single acre of these lands should be in Wilderness before now! So, I would suggest that you get busy and get the necessary paperwork done so these lands can be protected from man's stupidity. You guys will be safe until Bush is gone as he would veto any Wilderness Bill. (Individual, Corvallis, MT - #40)

Sample Statement:

I would hope that the new forest plan will set aside the maximum number of acres possible for future wilderness designation and preserve them. (Individual, Condon, MT - #352)

**PC #: 486**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should have one comprehensive plan that recommends wilderness and manages roadless areas adjoining the Bob Marshall Wilderness Complex.**

Sample Statement:

We need one comprehensive plan that recommends wilderness and manages as non-motorized all roadless public lands adjoining the Bob Marshall-Great Bear-Scapegoat Wilderness including.....on the Flathead National Forest: Swan Range, Spotted Bear River, Slippery Bill Wilderness; Trails should be fully restored in the Bunker Creek Wildlife Area....on the Lolo National Forest: (south) Swan Range, Dunham-Monture Creek,...on the Lewis and Clark and Helena National Forests - Rocky Mountain Front: Silver King-Falls Creek, Renshaw, Deep Creek, Teton Headwaters, Choteau-Blackleaf, Badger Two Medicine. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #548)

Sample Statement:

BOB MARSHALL WILDERNESS ECOSYSTEM(1) We need ONE plan that recommends wilderness and manages wildlands adjoining the Bob Marshall-Great Bear-Scapegoat Wilderness including: FLATHEAD NF: Swan Range-Bunker Cr, Spotted Bear River, Slippery Bill (consistent with WRA) Maintain the Bunker Creek Wildlife Unit and restore historic connecting wilderness trails in the area.--LOLO NF: (south) Swan Range, Dunham-Monture Creek--ROCKY MOUNTAIN FRONT: Silver King-Falls Creek, Renshaw, Deep Creek, Teton Headwaters, Choteau-Blackleaf, Badger Two Medicine (Preservation/Conservation, Helena, MT - #526)

Sample Statement:

The Lolo, Flathead and Bitterroot National Forests need ONE PLAN that recommends wilderness and manages as NON-MOTORIZED all wildlands adjoining the Bob Marshall-Great Bear-Scapegoat Wilderness including: Flathead NF: Swan Range, Spotted Bear River, Slippery Bill Wilderness trails should be restored in the Bunker Creek Wildlife Area. Lolo NF: (south) Swan Range, Dunham-Monture Creek. (Preservation/Conservation, Missoula, MT - #696)

**PC #: 495**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should do an economic analysis of wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

8. An economic analysis of Wilderness is needed. The analysis needs to go beyond acres and commercial forest products, and look at the values of Wilderness for watershed protection, for cultural and aesthetic purposes, as a biological reserve, for research and reference points, and for other non-traditional values. (Place Based Groups, Stevensville, MT - #823)

**PC #: 475**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act HR1105.**

Sample Statement:

I support all areas on the National Forests that are proposed for Wilderness designation in the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act HR1105. (Individual, Ventnor City, NJ - #215)

Sample Statement:

I would like to see a formal alternative in the DEIS that incorporates the following: Propose for Wilderness designation all areas proposed for Wilderness designation in the NREPA. (Business, Bigfork, MT - #252)

Sample Statement:

I propose for Wilderness designation all areas proposed for Wilderness designation in the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act (NREPA/H.R. 1105), which currently has 178 U.S. House of Representatives sponsors. (Individual, Petaluma, CA - #418)

Sample Statement:

Include into the National Wilderness Preservation System all areas that have been identified for their wilderness attributes. Support Interim FS Wilderness recommendations for areas identified for Wilderness designation in the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act, HR 1105. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #760)

**PC #: 492**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should extend the wilderness boundaries to areas under direct threat of motorized use or that have already incurred motorized use.**



## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

### Sample Statement:

I urge this Team to end this careless usage of our national treasure and sponsor the expansion the present wilderness boundaries to include those areas that are under direct threat from motor usage or have already been invaded. Wheels belong on roads and roads do not belong in the wild places. Should we allow Wilderness with capital W or with a little w be defiled by machine riders, who obviously do not care for anything but "the ride"? That is all they get. Give them a "sacrifice area" in some desolated corner rather than letting them turn the wild places into desolation. (Individual, Vaughn, MT - #590)

### **PC #: 474**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow roads as corridors in wilderness.**

##### Sample Statement:

More wilderness is actually taking land away from the end user. If some areas need a wilderness designation, some existing roads or even new roads should be allowed on a limited scale as corridors. (Recreational, Missoula, MT - #147)

### **PC #: 490**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish a new designation for wilderness areas that would allow for some management and low-impact seasonal motorized use.**

##### Sample Statement:

With an estimated population growth of 20+% for the Flathead Valley over the next 10 years, it does not seem logical to reduce the amount of public land acreage available for low or no cost multiple use. Studies show that only 2.5% of the recreating population uses Wilderness, and of this usage, the majority is high priced guided experiences. Increasing Wilderness in the Swan Valley, non-wilderness recreation will be funneled into an ever-decreasing area, creating a potential for overuse. Recommended Action: Create an additional designation for those areas under current Wilderness consideration. The designation would keep the same values as Wilderness, i.e., no new road construction, no timbering, and no mining. The new designation would however allow for low-impact, seasonal motorized use, and implement seasonal trail closures to various recreations that cause trail erosion during spring breakup. (Recreational, Bigfork, MT - #557)

##### Sample Statement:

Maintain the current Wilderness areas-no development. Establish new areas of "Wildlands". These would allow management but would specifically retain the wilderness charter. (Timber or Wood Products Industry, Stevensville, MT - #555)

##### Sample Statement:

I support adding some of the areas you have listed to the wilderness system. However, I believe some lands are better suited for some other management designation (perhaps "Back County") that would be less restrictive than "Big W" wilderness - but still retain the land's roadless, primitive character. I believe that some of the inventoried roadless could also fall under this designation. (Individual, Seeley Lake, MT - #517)

### **PC #: 489**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should only propose wildernesses for designation that are a direct result of collaborative community proposal.**

##### Sample Statement:

The Bitterroot NF has recommended 76,800 acres as additional wilderness to the existing 835,497 wilderness acres. Proposed areas are in the Blue Joint and Selway-Bitterroots. These areas should only move forward as a direct result of a collaborative community proposal and a recommendation to Congress. The forest plan cannot designate wilderness areas. (Timber or Wood Products Industry, Kalispell, MT - #539)

### **PC #: 487**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate designating all IRAs, identified in the Citizens reVision alternative, for proposed wilderness.**

##### Sample Statement:

Proposed Wilderness-We request that the three forests evaluate the impacts and benefits of designating all existing IRAs as proposed wilderness per the Citizen ReVision. We also request that another alternative be analyzed intermediate between the initial USFS proposal: for the designation of proposed wilderness and the Citizen reVision that would designate the following roadless areas as proposed wilderness based on their contribution to bull trout habitat maintenance/restoration, large and meso-carnivore connectivity, large native ungulates and quiet recreation: Analysis of an alternative embodying this intermediate amount of wilderness is reasonable and will illuminate the multiple benefits to increased proposed wilderness management. (Preservation/Conservation, Missoula, MT - #543)

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

Sample Statement:

To protect the unique values of these areas, the Citizen reVision proposes that they be managed to promote and restore wildlife connectivity by maintaining vegetative cover to facilitate wildlife movement and habitat security. (Preservation/Conservation, Helena, MT - #341)

**PC #: 485**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should create a wilderness corridor, above the Schley Mine, that connects the two parts of the Great Burn.**

Sample Statement:

Great Burn boundaries. We support all the Proposed Action additions to the Great Burn proposed wilderness. In addition, we request that you create a corridor above the Schley Mountain mine that would enable the two parts of the Great Burn to be connected. (Preservation/Conservation, Missoula, MT - #439)

Sample Statement:

In any case, important additions to the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness (including but not limited to lower Blodgett, lower Sheafman, lower Bass, lower Kootenai, Brooks, Mill (the land near Lolo Peak) and Camas Creeks) were omitted as were important areas in the Schley Mountain corridor and near Rocky Peak, White Mountain, and around Clearwater Crossing in Kelly Creek/the Great Burn and the Oregon Lakes/Trail Lakes area of the upper North Fork Clearwater. (Preservation/Conservation, Moscow, ID - #509)

**PC #: 484**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should designate the Sapphire Crest Trail from Patty Canyon to the Anaconda-Pintler Wilderness as a Montana Heritage Trail, free of motorized use.**

Sample Statement:

Additionally, standards should be adopted to keep roadless areas and proposed wilderness areas free of motorized traffic, keep motor vehicles off trails and only on existing roads; and, designate the Sapphire Crest Trail from Patty Canyon to the Anaconda Pintler Wilderness as a Montana Heritage Trail, free of motorized use. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #290)

**PC #: 483**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should only propose wilderness (and WSA) that are 100,000 acres or greater.**

Sample Statement:

Wilderness Study Areas: Areas must be large, 100,000 acres or more, or within a confined landscape, in order to achieve the remoteness and naturalness properly associated with Wilderness. However, smaller areas or non-confined landscapes may qualify as scenic, or backcountry recreation areas or Research Natural areas. Establishment of the existing small (under 100,000 acre) Wildernesses was a big mistake, as would be Wilderness proposals for existing inventoried Roadless areas under this size (Place Based Groups, Paradise, MT - #258)

**PC #: 482**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should not propose roaded IRAs for proposed wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

Some existing IRAs have roads, which disqualifies them as potential 'Wilderness'. As an example, Quigg has a road leading to Sliderock Lookout and down to upper Chico Gulch. Bushnell IRA has a road right to the mountaintop. (Place Based Groups, Paradise, MT - #258)

**PC #: 481**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should recommend all roadless areas on the Bitterroot, Flathead and Lolo National Forest for proposed wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

Make agency recommendation of wilderness designation for all remaining roadless lands. (Individual, Helena, MT - #575)

Sample Statement:

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

Many of the roadless lands on the Flathead would be best protected under provisions of the Wilderness Act. Timber values are marginal, at best, in many areas. Road construction costs and attendant erosion and water quality issues rarely justify removing slow-growing trees in these areas. What is now roadless should remain roadless. The current wilderness boundaries should also be strengthened. (Individual, Kalispell, MT - #549)

Sample Statement:

All of the roadless areas on the Flathead National Forest need to be recommended for future Wilderness consideration. These areas include, but are not limited to, the Bob Marshall Additions (Columbia Mountain, Northern Swan/Jewel Basin, Bunker Creek, and The Swan Face), the Great Bear Additions (Middle Fork and South Fork), and the Whitefish Range (from Tuchuck/Mt. Hefty to the Smokey Range). (Individual, Columbia Falls, MT - #617)

### **PC #: 480**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should retain existing Forest Plan standards which keep roadless areas and proposed wilderness areas free of motorized traffic.**

Sample Statement:

Please retain and enforce the existing forest plans standards that keep roadless areas and proposed wilderness free of all motorized use year round. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #487)

Sample Statement:

Please retain existing forest plan standards which keep roadless areas and proposed wilderness free of motorized traffic. The current Lolo forest plan states "there shall be no motorized use" in these areas. This standard needs to remain as is in the new plan. A forest wide standard to protect and manage remaining forest trails for traditional non motorized uses should be included in the revised plan. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #397)

Sample Statement:

I have a particular fondness for and ten years familiarity with the Great Burn, one of the most pristine, scenic, and wild places left in western Montana. Unless these areas remain roadless and unless motorized use is prohibited & enforced, one of the last and most beautiful wild places accessible from Missoula will surely be lost, forever. So, please keep the non-motorized use standard in the revised forest plan. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #458)

### **PC #: 479**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow motorized use in proposed wilderness or wilderness study areas.**

Sample Statement:

In establishing management directives to accomplish these goals, I fervently urge you to prohibit motorized use in proposed wilderness areas and roadless lands. I thank you for having that directive in the current management plan. This will maximize the charge to retain the "wilderness character" of proposed wilderness areas. - (Individual, Missoula, MT - #783)

Sample Statement:

I feel there should be an absolute banning of motorized use in these areas. (Individual, Lolo, MT - #479)

Sample Statement:

Wilderness and roadless lands must be preserved and protected from disturbance, and managed as non-motorized, secure areas for wildlife. (Individual, Bigfork, MT - #350)

Sample Statement:

[Having been on field trips to these places makes me want more than ever to see the banishment of the obnoxious fume emitting SUV groups and their dirt biker counterparts who are a selfish and biologically illiterate bunch. (Individual, Pacific Grove, CA - #874)]

### **PC #: 488**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should designate more wilderness to be able to provide more opportunity to use management ignited fire.**

Sample Statement:

More designated wilderness would provide additional opportunity to use this important management tool. (Individual, Columbia Falls, MT - #534)

Sample Statement:

EM-F2-A1: (We propose to expand the use of management-ignited fire to include wilderness and recommended wilderness areas, and increase the area where natural ignitions are managed for resource benefits.)More designated wilderness would

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

provide additional opportunity to use this important management tool. (Preservation/Conservation, Polebridge, MT - #705)

### **PC #: 493**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish these National Forest as National Preserves.**

Sample Statement:

I suggest tht these National Forests be established as National Preserves. To secure these areas as Wildlife Fish Plant Habitat Inventory Areas as they contain outstanding biological, scenic and wilderness attributes. To recover and restore watersheds and to preserve all old growth. To obliterate roads and to establish linkage corridors. Fully preserve all roadless areas and unroaded areas. (Individual, Minneapolis, MN - #729)

### **PC #: 477**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize areas that Montana Congressional delegations have agreed to in previous Wilderness Bills or those that have reached the President's desk.**

Sample Statement:

We're alarmed to see that the Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action falls short in its wilderness recommendations. The Proposed Action doesn't recommend areas that Montana's Congressional delegation has agreed to in the past, that have been in previous wilderness bills, or that have reached the President's desk. Our time spent in western Montana's roadless areas, including those listed above, has convinced us that they deserve the permanent protection of wilderness designation. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #529)

Sample Statement:

The proposed action doesn't recognize areas that Mt. Congressional Delegations has agreed to in the past that have been in previous Wilderness areas, or have reached the Pres. desk. (Individual, Bigfork, MT - #235)

Sample Statement:

I am very concerned about the future of wildlands on the Lolo National Forest. The "Proposed Action" falls woefully short in recommending wilderness. The Proposed Action doesn't recommend areas that Montana's Congressional delegation has agreed to in the past, that have been in previous wilderness bills, or that have reached the President's desk. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #547)

### **PC #: 465**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow motorized use in the proposed wilderness and not create de facto wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

The proposal calls for some additional acreage to be inventoried as proposed wilderness, I have to object because some, for example the Blue Joint area and the Little West Fork area are used by snowmobiles to access other areas. Furthermore these proposed wilderness areas and roadless areas should not be managed as de facto wilderness WE already have enough of wilderness management, maintain open positive routes and resource damage can be controlled. Please help us enjoy the forest and our recreation of choice and quit closing any more area, 50% wilderness is quite enough. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #518)

Sample Statement:

Please consider that it is a well-established fact that in summer as well as winter semi-primitive motorized doesn't need to be inconsistent with recommend wilderness designation Other forests and other regions have management areas with management direction for recommend for wilderness which fall in between some of the Lolo NF present designations (Individual, Missoula, MT - #41)

Sample Statement:

WILDERNESS AND ROADLESS-We oppose WRR-F2-A1 because you have chosen to attain consistency by completely eliminate motorized use Since there is disagreement about whether motorized should be allowed or not there is clearly not a statutory mandate to prohibit it; therefore, it should not be summarily prohibited. While there maybe a need for consistency, the burden to achieve it should not all fall on motorized use. Instead you should develop uniform guidelines within each forest and in a buffer area along forest boundaries that will help determine whether the areas shall be motorized or non-motorized. Motorized users should not be treated as second class citizens. (Recreational, Columbia Falls, MT - #589)

**PC #: 472**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the electronic site on Mt Aeneas**

**that is within proposed wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

there is some concern that the electronics site on Mt. Aeneas is in some jeopardy of being zoned inside of a protected wilderness boundary, thus rendering the site unusable for communications functions. The State of Montana is considering the site to be critical to the expansion of the new statewide interoperable communications system now being deployed in Lewis & Clark County, and along the highline in a project known as NTIP, the Northern Tier Interoperability Project. In order to create seamless data microwave path that will travel across the northern portion of the state, this project will incorporate many public safety agencies within Montana, including local law enforcement, fire, EMS, Search & Rescue, and other agencies. The system will also be available for use by any federal agency, including FBI, DEA, and of course the Forest Service and Parks Department. (State Agency or Official, Helena, MT - #97)

**PC #: 528**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should include all areas on all three forests that have been identified for wilderness recommendation.**

Sample Statement:

Include in the National Wilderness Preservation System all areas on all 3 forests that have been identified for their wilderness potential and qualities. (Individual, No Address - #357)

Sample Statement:

1). Wilderness designation: All areas on these National Forests proposed for wilderness should be recommended and designated for wilderness. I am specifically interested in the northern Whitefish Range, i.e. the Ten Lakes area, where I spend time hiking, biking and x-country skiing. (Individual, Columbia Falls, MT - #632)

Sample Statement:

I request that you please manage as many inventoried roadless areas in the Lolo National Forest, Flathead, and Bitterroot National Forest as wilderness areas. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #738)

**PC #: 464**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should not recommend the Great Burn, Bluejoint WSA, West Fork and Como Lake areas for wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

I recommend that the Great Burn area be removed from proposed wilderness and placed into roadless or primitive classification. The lengthy time with no decision on wilderness should cause this area to be removed wilderness consideration. (Individual, Superior, MT - #37)

Sample Statement:

The proposal calls for some additional acreage to be inventoried as proposed wilderness, I have to object because some, for example the Blue Joint area and the Little West Fork area are used by snowmobiles to access other areas. Furthermore these proposed wilderness areas and roadless areas should not be managed as de facto wilderness WE already have enough of wilderness management, maintain open positive routes and resource damage can be controlled. Please help us enjoy the forest and our recreation of choice and quit closing any more area, 50% wilderness is quite enough. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #518)

Sample Statement:

The proposed additions to recommended wilderness particularly in the Blue Joint area, the Little West Fork area and the Como Lake area, are important access and/or use areas to local snowmobilers and we would be opposed to the forest service including them in the recommended wilderness additions of the proposed revision. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #620)

**PC #: 529**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should officially designate the recommended wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

I would like to see the recommended areas for Wilderness officially designated as wilderness so that we can move forward. This proposed action has been languishing around for years and its time to move on it. (Individual, Condon, MT - #477)

**PC #: 476**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should not recommend any more areas for wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

NO MORE WILDERNESS SHOULD BE DESIGNATED! If it is wilderness your not allowed to manage it! (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #227)

Sample Statement:

If the area is very remote and is large enough to allow all natural forces to prevail throughout, including wildfire, the area may be suitable as Wilderness. However, setting existing areas aside as non-managed non-Wilderness lands is foolhardy, ultimately damaging to all resources, and in the end, counter to the very desires and expectations of those who would advocate such an ill thought out and destructive scheme! (Individual, Paradise, MT - #158)

Sample Statement:

No more access elimination! Open our public lands! (Individual, Kalispell, MT - #781)

**PC #: 530**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should relocate boundaries for MA-11 and MA-12 (Lolo NF) to more effectively manage recommended wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

MA11 and MA12 Boundaries could be relocated to more effectively manage recommendations for wilderness. Previous past Forest leadership has discussed this issue and has concluded restrictions of motorized use in areas recommended for wilderness is not needed to maintain those physical characteristics which qualify the recommended area for wilderness. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #35)

**PC #: 467**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should recommend the Weydemeyer Wilderness proposal (NF of the Flathead) for proposed wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

Proposed forest plan revision fails to recommend wilderness for the eminently wild North Fork wildlands of Thompson-Seton, Tuchuck and Hefty. This area was first proposed for wilderness designation in 1925 by Fortine rancher Winton Weydemeyer, who wrote to a national forestry magazine in response to a provocative article by Aldo Leopold. These lands have been included in most Montana wilderness bills before Congress, including the proposal vetoed by Ronald Reagan in 1988. Former Flathead NF Recreation Officer Jerry Stokes strongly advocated for their inclusion in the first forest plan, only to be overruled by the cynical political currents flowing from the Reagan Administration. Sen. Burns included most of these lands in his wilderness proposal in the early 1990s. Also in the early 1990s, when I worked closely with District Ranger Tom Hope on this issue, he was very amenable to the proposed wilderness, and he even agreed with me that the Frozen Lake Road should be included in a unified Tuchuck-Hefty Wilderness. With the recent snowmobile agreement clearly establishing non-motorized uses for most of these roadless lands, the biggest obstacle to wilderness designation should have been resolved. In the context of continued trans boundary discussions for the North Fork, including the proposed Peace Park expansion in the Canadian Flathead, I believe your failure to include a wilderness recommendation for the North Fork sends the wrong message to our Canadian friends about America's commitment to preserve this world-class, landscape. (Preservation/Conservation, Charlo, MT - #47)

Sample Statement:

All of the purposed additions to the Bob Marshall are worthy. Finally, I have spent a great deal of time in the Whitefish Range and, as a consequence, I strongly support wilderness designation for the Winton Weydemeyer proposal. (Individual, Whitefish, MT - #427)

Sample Statement:

I am writing to encourage you to designate areas as wilderness, closed to vehicles, roadless areas in the Jewel Basin, the Great Bear and the area proposed by the Montana Wilderness Association as the Winton Weydemeyer Proposed Wilderness. As a resident of Montana and a citizen of the United States I depend on government agencies including the Forest Service to protect the existing values of our park and forest lands, and where those values have been degraded or threatened, to promote their restoration. (Individual, West Glacier, MT - #670)

**PC #: 494**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should treat these three forests as wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

The three forest areas need to be treated as a wilderness area. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #743)

**PC #: 469**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should include those lands previously considered for wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

This action disguises the deletion of many areas previously proposed as Wilderness by congressional actions. I object to the manner that this discussion does not identify those areas previously considered for Wilderness, such as Stoney Mountain. This proposal lacks emphasis on ecological retention of high value, ecologically intact areas emulated elsewhere in your revision proposals. (Individual, No Address - #53)

Sample Statement:

We recommend the forests maintain the wilderness recommendations from the existing forest plans - with boundary and acreage adjustments only made if a tract has been developed since the forest plans were first approved. We also urge the forests to recommend wilderness designation for all inventoried roadless lands comprising the Great Burn proposed wilderness, Quigg Peak Roadless area, Stony Mountain Roadless Area, Monture Creek roadless addition to the Bob Marshall Wilderness and the West Fork Clearwater roadless addition to the Mission Mountains Wilderness Area. All these areas have outstanding wilderness values, and, importantly; support important watershed and fishery values. The standard commodity values of each of these areas are marginal enough that they do not outweigh the watershed, fishery, wildlife and recreational values. (Preservation/Conservation, Missoula, MT - #488)

**PC #: 478**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect wildlands by proposing for wilderness: The Great Burn, Sheep Mt., Burdette, Selway Bitterroot additions, Bob Marshall Wilderness additions, Mission Mountain additions, Great Bear Wilderness additions, Stoney Mt., Quigg Peak, Sapphire WSA, Bluejoint WSA, Lolo Peak, Cataract Creek, Cube-Iron Mt., Swan Range/Front, Rock Creek, West Fork Clearwater, Bunker Creek, Jewel Basin, Allen Mt., Sleeping Child, and Le Beau area.**

Sample Statement:

I am concerned that after all is said and done, the new forest plan may not continue to manage the Great Burn area as wilderness. I feel it is extremely important that the forest plan will encompass this area as wilderness, regardless of the fact that it is not actually designated this way. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #746)

Sample Statement:

Focus on wilderness protection for the Sapphire Roadless area, the Quigg peak roadless area, the blue joint roadless area and of course, the Great Burn roadless area. (Individual, No Address - #703)

Sample Statement:

The new forest plans should manage - and recommend for wilderness designation - the Stony Mountain, Quigg Peak, and Sapphire Mountains roadless areas. The new forest plans new forest plans should manage - and recommend for wilderness designation - roadless lands in the southern Swan Range adjacent to the Bob Marshall Wilderness and in the Monture Creek area. The Cube Iron-Mt. Silcox should be managed as wilderness and recommended for wilderness designation. (Individual, Helena, MT - #575)

Sample Statement:

I also urge you to protect roadless lands by designating them as wilderness. In particular, the Swan Front and Swan Crest have some of the most diverse wildlife and plant species in the lower 48 states. (Individual, Swan Valley, MT - #476)

Sample Statement:

Certainly, much more acreage should be included in the greater Bob Marshall, Great Bear and Mission Mountain areas, including the Northern Swan and Jewel Basin. (Individual, Polson, MT - #581)

Sample Statement:

The new proposed plan for the Bitterroot could be very unfriendly to these wild places and the quiet mountain trails could be converted to rutted, weed filled, ATV highways. Please consider strong protection for the following wildlands in your forest plan:-EAST FACE BITTERROOT CANYONS There are over 100,000 acres in this area of Kootenai Creek to Blodgett Canyon that remain unprotected and should receive protection.-BLUEJOINT WILDERNESS STUDY AREA Two deep canyons in the upper West Fork bordering the River the River of No Return Wilderness for 17 miles on the Montana Idaho border.-ALLAN MOUNTAIN 100,000 wild acres of trout, elk, waterfalls and mountain trails in this wonderful landscape.-SAPPHIRES WSA This a biological diverse heartland of lush wildlands that adjoin the Pintlar Wilderness and is a prime area

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

for elk habitat. Please consider adopting Lob forest plan standards which keep roadless areas and wilderness free of motorized traffic. KEEP MOTORIZED TRAFFIC ON ROADS WHERE THEY BELONG. I also have a personal love for the 100-mile-long SAPPHERE CREST TRAIL and would strongly desire to see it designated as Non Motorized. (Individual, Columbia Falls, MT - #289)

**PC #: 531**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should use separate tables to show forest plan strategy for each roadless management category.**

Sample Statement:

The AMS describes management direction for recommended wilderness in existing plans as "varied." A closer look reveals Separate tables should be used to illustrate forest plans strategy for each roadless management category. Attached is an example of a chart displaying how the Flathead plan manages recreation in roadless areas. (Preservation/Conservation, Helena, MT - #526)

**PC #: 498**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should not replace MA-11 with the new MA-1; the appropriate new MA should be MA-2.**

Sample Statement:

Regarding Management Area Crosswalk-Management Area Category 1; this is not an appropriate category for placement of Ma 11 and Recommended For Wilderness. The appropriate placement is in Category 2. Congress never intended to have areas administered as "de facto wilderness" which were recommended for wilderness consideration. They were to be administered as they were on the date of enactment of the "Act". (Individual, Missoula, MT - #217)

**PC #: 499**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should have trails closed to OHV use unless posted open.**

Sample Statement:

Two other changes are needed in the proposed revision on OHV use:1. Do not permit motor use on trails in inventoried roadless areas.2. Change signing policy so that trails are closed to OHV use unless signed open. (Preservation/Conservation, Stevensville, MT - #612)

**PC #: 532**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should keep inventoried roadless areas that are not recommended for wilderness, roadless as consistent with the Roadless Rule.**

Sample Statement:

We recommend all roadless areas not being recommended at this time for wilderness but which are inventoried be kept roadless as consistent with the Forest Service's Roadless Rule. We agree the forests should update inventoried roadless areas found in existing forest plans. But we also recommend the forests take a look at so-called "non-inventoried roadless" resources to see if they are more appropriately managed today under the Roadless Rule or as recommended wilderness. (Preservation/Conservation, Missoula, MT - #488)

**PC #: 521**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should utilize a forest-wide standard that prohibits motorized use on any trails.**

Sample Statement:

These areas deserve to be free of off-road motorized vehicles. The current Lolo National Forest plan states, "There shall be no motorized use" in these areas. Let's keep it that way. In fact, as planners, you should strengthen this idea by putting into place a forest- wide standard to protect and manage the remaining forest trails for traditional, non- motorized uses. Make sure vehicles stay on roads. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #474)

Sample Statement:

Please manage all roadless lands free of motor vehicles year round. Please keep motor vehicles on roads not trails and not off road. (Individual, Helena, MT - #515)



**PC #: 509**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage the Swan-Jewel and Swan Front as non-motorized, non-mechanized roadless recreation.**

Sample Statement:

Should Congress decide to not add the Swan-Jewel and the Swan Front to the wilderness system (an eventuality that the MWA does not anticipate), these areas should still be managed for non-motorized (which is defined here to include a ban on mountain bicycles) roadless recreation. The land is ideally suited to such use. It has virtually no productive timberland while having outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation. (Individual, Kalispell, MT - #752)

**PC #: 500**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow motorized use in roadless areas.**

Sample Statement:

We oppose motorized recreation on roadless lands to: 1) preserve the habitat effectiveness of roadless lands, 2) to prevent resource damage, 3) in recognition that the non-motorized landscape is shrinking and becoming ever-more valuable, and 4) to provide the growing population of humanity places of refuge, solitude and quiet. (Preservation/Conservation, Kalispell, MT - #256)

Sample Statement:

I am asking the Forest Service to manage roadless areas to maintain there wilderness values, one way to do this would be eliminating motorized travel routes. Please consider restoring low-elevation traditional, non-motorized foot and horse access to the forest areas. Enforcing non-motorized closures would go a long way to helping preserve the character of a wilderness area. (Individual, Bigfork, MT - #359)

Sample Statement:

Please manage roadless areas to maintain their wilderness character and eliminate motorized travel routes through then AND, enforce it! The plans should include requesting the funding for enforcement. (Individual, Kalispell, MT - #468)

Sample Statement:

The Plan Revision must safeguard the habitat of rare wildlife such as grizzly bears, wolverines, and others by maintaining ALL the remaining roadless lands for non-motorized use only. The Bitterroot, Flathead and Lolo National Forests are incredibly important to the survival of endangered species. The remaining roadless lands must not be fragmented by development of any kind. (Individual, Minneapolis, MN - #532)

**PC #: 503**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage unroaded areas to maintain the natural mix of early and late seral tree species, as well as a natural mix of native flora and fauna in all stages of development.**

Sample Statement:

All other presently unroaded and unmanaged areas should be managed to maintain the natural mix of early seral and late seral tree species as well as a natural mix of all native flora and fauna in all stages of development including the shrub, seedling- sapling, and young tree and old tree stages. (Place Based Groups, Paradise, MT - #258)

**PC #: 507**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should change all management areas suitable for timber production that are in roadless, to a classification for proposed wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

Change all the Management Areas that are in the roadless areas that are suitable for timber production to a classification for proposed wilderness or large roadless blocks for recreation and wildlife, example change from Lolo MA 16 to Lolo MA 11 or 12. (Individual, Thompson Falls, MT - #585)

**PC #: 512**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should not maintain the "unroaded" character**

**of the land.**

Sample Statement:

Any review and update, WRR-F3-A2, must be done according to the rules and standards of RARE II and not RACR... There must be no new categories such as "unroaded" of land management not addressed in RARE II. There should be no management concern for maintaining the "unroaded" character of a land area. (Recreational, Columbia Falls, MT - #589)

**PC #: 510**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage inventoried roadless areas under the current legislation of RARE II.**

Sample Statement:

We are opposed to implementing the Roadless Area Conservation Rule to this forest plan until all legal actions are resolved and Forest Service Rulemaking is complete (FP-F1-A2). Until then, the current legislation of RARE II should govern activities in inventoried roadless areas. (Place Based Groups, No Address - #968)

Sample Statement:

Any review and update, WRR-F3-A2, must be done according to the rules and standards of RARE II and not RACR... There must be no new categories such as "unroaded" of land management not addressed in RARE II. There should be no management concern for maintaining the "unroaded" character of a land area. [Action WRR-F3-A2: (We propose to review and update inventoried roadless areas found in Appendix C of the current forest plans as required by NFMA.)] (Recreational, Columbia Falls, MT - #589)

**PC #: 504**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should maintain all existing routes, uses, buildings and roads present at the time of designation as a roadless area or wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

The agency not only has a responsibility to prevent degradation of Roadless Area wilderness qualities, but must ensure that all the existing values of the Roadless Area are not degraded so that Congress can use its prerogative to release the area for other uses. Therefore, existing roads, trails, and ways must be maintained in order to protect Congress' prerogative to adequately assess whether a Roadless Area should be designated and Wilderness or released for other uses. Congress' prerogative (authority) to decide to release the area for other uses is as important as its prerogative (authority) to designate the area as Wilderness. The agency lacks authority to jeopardize Congress' prerogative by manipulating the existing values of a Roadless Area. Actions taken in this plan that jeopardize Congress' prerogative are arbitrary and capricious and in violation of the Wilderness Act. [Footnote 1: 16 U.S.C. [section] 1131. See also, Parker v. U.S., 307 F. Supp 685 (1969) and Parker v. U.S., 309 F. Supp. 593 at 597 (1970). Therefore, the agency must maintain all existing routes, uses, buildings and roads present at the time of designation of the area as a Roadless or Wilderness Area. (County Agency or Official, Superior, MT - #507)

**PC #: 506**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should stay out of inventoried roadless areas unless they are in the urban interface but do treatments without building roads.**

Sample Statement:

Stay out of the inventoried roadless areas unless they are on the urban interface but do any treatment with no new roads. (Individual, Thompson Falls, MT - #585)

Sample Statement:

However, timber harvest would still be allowed as one tool for achieving ecosystem health as outlined in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.) Totally NIX this action. Leave these wildland areas alone unless a portion of them are within fire danger zones to communities. Let nature do its job! (Individual, Condon, MT - #638)

**PC #: 522**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should classify roadless lands as unsuitable for oil and gas leasing.**

Sample Statement:

MWA [Montana Wilderness Alliance] members agree that all roadless lands have values that should be "actively managed"

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

with backcountry rangers, visitor contacts, trail maintenance, education and site rehabilitation where necessary. Wildlands (roadless) should be classed as unsuitable for oil and gas leasing, with no surface occupancy or siting of industrial facilities. (Preservation/Conservation, Helena, MT - #526)

### **PC #: 513**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow any commercial harvest in roadless areas but thinning may be allowed in extreme cases.**

Sample Statement:

I concur but much roadless land in the Flathead has not been inventoried even though it may warrant protection as much as adjacent inventoried lands. As noted in the ICBEMP Assessment volumes, roadless lands - inventoried or not - have the highest ecological integrity of all national forest lands. Timber harvest in the guise of HFI thinning is more likely to worsen the drying effects of current warming trends and thus hasten health decline. No commercial harvest should be allowed in roadless areas, but thinning may be justified and allowed in extreme cases. (Individual, Bigfork, MT - #600)

### **PC #: 502**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow/encourage motorized use in roadless areas.**

Sample Statement:

Management direction is "to retain the undeveloped, natural appearing, character...to assure protection of resource and social attributes." Non-motorized use is specified. This is the wrong approach. Two-wheeled vehicles should be encouraged as discussed above. (Place Based Groups, Paradise, MT - #258)

Sample Statement:

Judge Brimmer (10th Circuit Judge) has ruled last July that since the National Forest Management Act and the Wilderness Act requires major changes in a Forest Plan be made through the Forest Planning Process, and that only Congress can designate Wilderness, the Roadless Rule is illegal! This decision was enjoined by Idaho Judge Locke last December.2. Since the IRAs are not Wilderness, why are motorized vehicles being excluded (OHV's and snowmobiles) under this 'Plan'? (Individual, Paradise, MT - #42)

Sample Statement:

Areas to be considered for Wilderness Study should be open to 2-wheeled vehicles (both non-motorized and motorized), because these vehicles make single-track trails just like people, horses, deer, and elk The difference between horse use and 2-wheeled vehicle use is that 2-wheeled vehicles provide far less impact per user than does horse use. (Place Based Groups, Paradise, MT - #258)

### **PC #: 511**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should update roadless inventories and establish clear standards and directions.**

Sample Statement:

Forest Plans need to update roadless inventories as well as establish clear standards and direction. (Preservation/Conservation, Helena, MT - #526)

### **PC #: 519**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow temp/permanent roads in unroaded areas that have not been selected for wilderness study areas/proposed wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

Unroaded and unmanaged areas, which have not been selected as Wilderness Study Areas, should remain open to management and developed with temporary and/or permanent roads deemed appropriate to the management philosophy. Some of these presently unroaded and unmanaged areas may qualify as Back Country (semi-primitive or primitive, either motorized or non-motorized) recreation areas. (Individual, Paradise, MT - #158)

### **PC #: 501**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should divide roadless lands not recommended for wilderness, into two categories: semi-primitive motorized and**

**semi-primitive non-motorized.**

Sample Statement:

Roadless lands not recommended for wilderness should be defined into one of two possibilities: 1) Primitive lands not designated as wilderness or classified as semi-primitive to be managed as described in 36 CFR 293.17. Primitive areas may allow some uses not generally allowed in Wilderness Areas, i.e. mountain biking, limited timber harvest for specific purposes as described in 36 CFR 294.13 and mineral leasing with no surface occupancy. 2) Semi-Primitive: Lands not designated as wilderness or classified as Primitive to be managed as semi-primitive, non-motorized areas. Semi-primitive areas may allow winter motorized use pursuant to written agreements, limited timber harvest for specific purposes as described in 36 CFR 294.13 and mineral leasing with no surface occupancy. (Preservation/Conservation, Kalispell, MT - #256)

Sample Statement:

Roadless lands not recommended by the Forest Service for wilderness should be defined into one of two possibilities: 1) Primitive land not designated as wilderness or classified as semi-primitive to be managed as described in 36 CFR 293.17. Primitive areas may allow some uses not generally allowed in Wilderness Areas, i.e., mountain biking, limited timber harvest for specific purposes as described in 36 CFR 294.13 and mineral leasing with no surface occupancy. 2) Semi-Primitive: Lands not designated as wilderness or classified as Primitive to be managed as semi-primitive, non-motorized areas. Semi-primitive areas may allow winter motorized use pursuant to written agreements, limited timber harvest for specific purposes as described in 36 CFR 294.13 and mineral leasing with no surface occupancy. (Individual, Columbia Falls, MT - #534)

**PC #: 516**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop an alternative that excludes all IRAs and un-inventoried roadless areas from the suitable timber base.**

Sample Statement:

Friends of the Bitter Root supports the Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action (1/23/04) statement proposing "to exclude inventoried roadless areas from the suitable timber lands", FOB strongly disagrees with the statement that "timber harvest would still be allowed?". The Forest Plan Revision process (as proposed) needs to develop and analyze alternatives that exclude all inventoried and un-inventoried roadless areas from the suitable timber base, but - alternatives also need to be developed that prohibit timber harvest in all inventoried and un-inventoried roadless areas - period. (Preservation/Conservation, Hamilton, MT - #720)

**PC #: 517**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow any timber harvesting in IRAs and un-inventoried roadless areas.**

Sample Statement:

The Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action states, "we propose to plan an integrated timber harvest program on: 1) land classified as suitable for timber production, and 2) land classified as not suitable for timber production", (FP-F2-A1). It appears that the Forest Service proposal "to exclude inventoried roadless areas from the suitable timber lands", (FP-F1-A2) is essentially just a meaningless smokescreen-type statement because of the above qualifications found at FP-F2-A1. The Forest Service proposal apparently intends to continue attempting to log in the inventoried and un-inventoried roadless lands. The revised Plans will just say it is for reasons other than timber production - such as "resource improvement", "forest health", "wildfire risk", or "insect/disease control". Regardless, the outcome is the same; the Forest Service openly proposes to continue logging the remaining roadless lands in spite of their ecological importance and rarity. This is unacceptable. (Preservation/Conservation, Hamilton, MT - #720)

Sample Statement:

All Inventoried Roadless Areas should be protected from all extractive activities and motorized recreation impacts. The Lolo National Forest Plan currently states that "there shall be no motorized use" in wild land areas. (Individual, Bozeman, MT - #577)

**PC #: 518**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage all inventoried roadless areas as wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

In order to mitigate effects of heavy impacts (i.e. snowmobile, TV) I would like to see inventoried roadless areas managed as wilderness. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #726)

Sample Statement:

Manage all roadless lands as if they were designated wilderness...The current Lolo Forest plan includes a management mandate that should be applied to all roadless lands in the forthcoming Lolo and Bitterroot plans: "There shall be no motorized use." The clarity, ecological wisdom, and long-term benefits of that phrase should be retained for all roadless lands. (Individual, Helena, MT - #575)

**PC #: 508**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use RACR as it is not law.**

Sample Statement:

The RACR is not law, and most likely will not ever become law. Including this in the new plans is arbitrary and capricious. (Multiple Use or Land Rights, Whitefish, MT - #721)

Sample Statement:

One final concern with this document is the use of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule definitions. The RACR is currently not in effect and any definitions contained only in that document and not elsewhere should not be used as part of any proposed actions dealing with inventoried roadless areas. (Timber or Wood Products Industry, Helena, MT - #334)

**PC #: 514**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should add contiguous unroaded areas, that are adjacent to proposed wilderness, to that proposed wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

Management of Unroaded Areas Contiguous to Proposed Wilderness Areas. When such areas are contiguous with roadless areas proposed for Wilderness management, these areas shall become part of the proposed Wilderness. (Preservation/Conservation, Helena, MT - #341)

**PC #: 496**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should keep unroaded lands unroaded.**

Sample Statement:

Keep all roadless areas roadless, retaining their wilderness appeal! (Individual, Missoula, MT - #421)

Sample Statement:

We should attempt to protect the small percentage of roadless forest by stopping any new road building. (Individual, Bigfork, MT - #471)

Sample Statement:

I plead with you to make sure that plan continues to keep current road-less lands without roads. Please retain the current plan standards on the Lolo NF to keep wilderness areas free of motorized traffic.. (Individual, Bozeman, MT - #636)

**PC #: 505**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should not sacrifice any additional suitable timberlands to "no active management".**

Sample Statement:

The proposed action suggests returning to the Clinton Roadless Rule as the Inventoried Roadless Area (IRA) management tool. The Clinton Roadless Rule has yet to be settled in court. The interim direction should be the current plan's roadless guidelines and the current Executive Branch's objectives for managing the IRAs. Sacrificing any additional suitable timberlands to no active management is not a wise direction considering current stand conditions. (Timber or Wood Products Industry, Kalispell, MT - #539)

Sample Statement:

Wilderness Recommendations and Roadless Areas provide another cause of angst for me. There appears to be a never-ending goal of adding more and more land to the off-limits category for active forest management. To propose even more acreage for wilderness designation when Congress has yet to act on the numerous "wilderness study areas" is absurd. It appears to be simply another way to stop economic activity on public land. (Timber or Wood Products Industry, Helena, MT - #334)

**PC #: 515**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should make all inventoried roadless areas subjected to inventories and public involvement as prescribed by NFMA and NEPA before management prescriptions and actions proposed with Forest Plan revision are determined.**

Sample Statement:

For all intents and purposes, the Plan treats many IRAs as Wilderness (albeit with the provision that some unregulated timber may be carefully harvested from the areas in the event of heavy insect infestations or wildfire salvage). Far many IRAs

under this Plan classification, neither motorized recreation nor any significant management will be allowed. All management decisions are to be made within these guidelines, and many people believe that those decisions will lean more and more toward the preservation philosophy. IRAs must be subjected to all the inventories, tests, and public involvement as prescribed by NFM MUSYA, and NEPA before management prescriptions and actions proposed under the Plan Revision may be determined. (Individual, Paradise, MT - #511)

**PC #: 520**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should use the Cumulative Effects Model (CEM) to consider proposed roadless parcels.**

Sample Statement:

When Big Mountain went through the NEPA process, the Flathead Forest requested us to provide them with Cumulative Effects Mode (CEM) for an area encompassing approximately 100 square miles. We did this, and it has been a valuable tool for both our staff and Forest Service staff. This process forces everyone to consider all the resources, uses, and values when considering an array of alternatives. The Forest Plan could be the venue to consider each of these proposed roadless parcels, and how they are intertwined to surrounding lands. (Business, Whitefish, MT - #142)

**PC #: 526**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should look at an alternative where suitable timber base in inventoried roadless areas remains the same.**

Sample Statement:

We suggest that in addition to evaluating the proposed action, the Forest Service also evaluate an action that says, "The suitable timber base in inventoried roadless areas will remain the same." (Place Based Groups, Columbia Falls, MT - #565)

**PC #: 524**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit jet skies and motorboats from lakes bordering roadless areas.**

Sample Statement:

Jet skis and motor boats must be prohibited from lakes bordering (and of course within) Forest roadless areas. The noise of these craft travels far from here they are operated. This noise is obviously very disturbing to wildlife. It also impairs the recreational opportunities for the majority of Forest users - the Quiet Recreational users. If motors are allowed on boats on the bordering waters, then they should be limited to no more than 10 hp. (Individual, Minneapolis, MN - #532)

**PC #: 525**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow cross-country bicycle travel.**

Sample Statement:

The proposed wilderness should not be treated as de facto wilderness. Access should be left as it presently is. The small boundary changes are okay. At this time bicycle travel need not be excluded from cross country travel unless resource damage occurs, then treat areas on a case by case basis. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #563)

**PC #: 527**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow structures or caches at any campsites or dams that are in wilderness or roadless areas.**

Sample Statement:

Wilderness and roadless areas should retain wilderness character as much as possible. There should be no structure or caches allowed at any camp areas or dams. (Individual, Stevensville, MT - #668)

**PC #: 523**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish a 2-year timeline for designated OHV Routes. After the 2 years, any forest not meeting this timeline will default to motorized use only on roads/OHV routes that have been analyzed and designated for OHV use.**

Sample Statement:

Adopt a deadline for designations. Establishing a two-year timeline for developing a system of designated off-road vehicle

routes, after which any Forest that has not completed designations and closed renegade roads/routes will allow motorized recreational use only on roads/ORV routes that have been analyzed and then designated for such use. (Preservation/Conservation, Missoula, MT - #527)

**PC #: 341**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage Wilderness Study Areas (Sapphire and Blue Joint) on the Bitterroot as Wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

Sapphire & Blue Joint Wilderness Study Areas-The cultural factors have changed since these areas were considered in the current plan. He believes the goal should be to manage these areas more like wilderness. He recognizes that the Montana Wilderness Study Act specifies that past levels of motorized use are allowed, and realizes that we may have to allow that to continue. (Individual, Stevensville, MT - #195)

**PC #: 342**

**Public Concern: The FS should manage Wilderness Study Areas under existing direction which allows motorized use.**

Sample Statement:

The Proposed Action made no statement with respect to changes in management direction for the two Wilderness Study Areas on the Bitterroot National Forest. We support the existing management direction in these areas, which allows motorized use to occur. P.L. 95-150, the Montana Wilderness Study Act, allows continuation of uses in place in 1977. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #489)

**PC #: 349**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage Rock Creek and its tributaries on the Lolo NF as a Wild, Scenic, Recreational River**

Sample Statement:

We would also like to request that the Rock Creek watershed be managed in a way that will maintain its eligibility for Wild & Scenic Rivers designation. (Federal Agency or Official, Washington, DC - #342)

Sample Statement:

Wild, Scenic, and Recreation River status to protect key watersheds and native trout fisheries such as: Scenic River designation for Rock Creek and Wild River designation for Ranch Creek. (Preservation/Conservation, Missoula, MT - #719)

Sample Statement:

Wild & Scenic River Recommendations-Lolo National Forest Rock Creek Watershed-Note: The upper portion of the Rock Creek Watershed is on the Deerlodge National Forest and is also proposed for Wild and Scenic River designations, but for the purposes of the forest plan revision process, only the portions on the Lolo National Forest are proposed below. The main fork of Rock Creek on the Lolo National Forest downstream to the mouth of Rickard Gulch is recommended for Scenic River designation. Ranch Creek, from its source downstream 5 miles to the boundary of the Lolo National Forest, is recommended for Wild River designation. Welcome Creek, from its source downstream 7 miles to the confluence with Rock Creek, is recommended for Wild River designation. Alder Creek, from its source downstream 5 miles to the confluence with Rock Creek, is recommended for Wild River designation. Hogback Creek, from its source downstream 6 miles to the confluence with Rock Creek, is recommended for Wild River designation. Wyman Gulch, from its source downstream 5 miles to the confluence with Rock Creek, is recommended for Wild River designation. (Preservation/Conservation, Helena, MT - #341)

**PC #: 348**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should add improvements to the Meadow Creek Airstrip.**

Sample Statement:

Given that Meadow Creek airstrip is within the WSR corridor -- how could water be added to the campground that is present and would allow users similar experience as Schafer and maybe take some of the use from Schafer to Meadow Creek. This is a wild section of the corridor. (Recreational, Kalispell, MT - #66)

**PC #: 343**

**Public Concern: The FS should not designate special areas such as critical waterways, geological areas, unroaded areas, botanical areas, national scenic areas, research natural areas and scenic byways, that affect the multiple use and sustained yield mandates**

Sample Statement:

...with regard to critical waterways, geological areas, unroaded areas, botanical areas, and national scenic areas, the BLM and FS have no statutory authority to designate and manage such areas. Any such designations can by law have no effect on the multiple use and sustained yield mandates for management of national forests. Accordingly, these "special designations" should be deleted from the proposed alternative. (Recreational, Helena, MT - #339)

Sample Statement:

With regard to research and natural areas and scenic by-ways, the BLM and FS can designate such areas; however such designation should have no effect on the multiple use and sustained yield mandates for management of those public lands. (Recreational, Helena, MT - #339)

**PC #: 345**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage Scenic and Heritage Trails as non-motorized.**

Sample Statement:

I am especially concerned about the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail Travel Management (the CDT between Gibbons Pass north to the Anaconda-Pintlar boundary). When the Continental Divide Scenic Trail was being established, it was concluded that the entire Trail would allow only non-motorized use. Now you are deciding whether to allow motorized use on portions of the Trail. I strongly believe that it would be wrong to allow motorized use on the Trail between Gibbons Pass north to the Anaconda-Pintlar boundary. During years passed the Forest Service closed portions of the Sapphire Divide Trail to motorized use. Although these closures have never been changed by the Forest Service, trail users on all-terrain motorized vehicles have been coming by the hundreds to the closed portions of the trail and getting confused or ignoring the closure signs and regulations. As a result much damage has been done to these foot and horseback trail portions, in addition to the adjacent meadows. Give them part of the trail, and they are induced to take it all. I know. I have hiked and ridden horseback many times over the no-motorized portions of both the Sapphire and Continental Divide Trails and met the travelers on their all-terrain vehicles. To enforce no use of motorized vehicles on the closed portions of the trail would require almost constant patrol by Forest Service officers. The noise and pollution of the motorized vehicles, the disturbance to the hikers and horseback riders, in addition to the major wildlife, and the quality of the natural scenery are greatly diminished. I respectfully urge you to not allow motorized use on the Continental Divide Trail between Gibbons Pass north to the Anaconda-Pintlar border. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #287)

Sample Statement:

Heritage Trail: We urge the Forest Service to designate the Sapphire Crest Trail as a Montana Heritage Trail, a 100-mile segment without ORV traffic. Here in our region the Appalachian Trail runs 2,000 miles from Maine to Georgia without any motorized traffic. Surely the same can be done for such a key trail in Montana. (Individual, Baltimore, MD - #402)

**PC #: 350**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage the Lolo NF suitable lands as MA category 4 and unsuitable lands as MA category 3.**

Sample Statement:

Action WRR-F3-A5: ADD. [Proposed Additional] We propose current suitable areas should be management area category 4 and current non-suitable areas should be management area category 3. Bushnell and Pat's Knob shall be managed as category 3. Emphasis of category 3 would be limited motorized use and forest products and dispersed recreation. Emphasis of category 4 is forest products and high use dispersed recreation. (Place Based Groups, No Address - #822)

**PC #: 352**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage access and facilities in the NFPLI with other resource values.**

Sample Statement:

NATIONAL FOREST AND PRIVATE LAND INTERFACE MANAGEMENT-We generally agree with the findings and actions under this heading, unless it leads to undue expenditure that might actually promote further interface development. We support action NF-F1-A5 if it implies maintaining or improving public access. [Action NF-F1-A5: (Recreational, No Address - #579)]



## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

Sample Statement:

Action NF-F1-A4: Infrastructure needs should not threaten other forest values such as wildlife. For example, paving the North Fork Road would have a huge effect on, among other things, the wildlife, of the Flathead National Forest. The Forest Service should take an active roll in community discussions when infrastructure improvements threaten Forest values. (Individual, Columbia Falls, MT - #534)

Sample Statement:

Action NF-F1-A5: "Land adjustment goals" should include purchase or easement of private land for wildlife habitat protection, linkage zones, etc. The concentration of private land interface areas in valley bottoms or critical low elevation habitat makes them even more important. (Individual, Columbia Falls, MT - #534)

Sample Statement:

NF-F2: During high fire danger, roads and OHV use in the interface should be closed earlier than in areas of the forest farther away. Our home in Columbia Falls is in the Forest interface and people's behavior driving nearby forest roads or riding ORVs terrifies us every fire season. Fires started by kids partying, sparks from ORVs and the numerous cigarettes flicked out the window can start a fire that will threaten homes within minutes. (Individual, Columbia Falls, MT - #534)

Subconcern:

### **BECAUSE OF PRIVATE LANDOWNERS CLOSING OFF ACCESS.**

Sample Statement:

Action NF-F1-A3 There have been problems with access as more people move into the interface and close off traditional access routes through their properties to public lands. Action NF-F1-A5 --One problem with consolidation of the checkerboard lands is that right now it is hard for someone to block access to a large area. If the lands were consolidated, with solid blocks of private land on one side of the fence and solid blocks of public land on the other, the private landowners could block access. Easements need to be preserved. (Place Based Groups, Kalispell, MT - #828)

### **PC #: 364**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage vegetation in unroaded and unmanaged areas**

Sample Statement:

All other presently unroaded and unmanaged areas should be managed to maintain the natural mix of early seral and late seral tree species as well as a natural mix of all flora and fauna in all stages of development including the shrub, seedling-sapling, and young tree stages. (Individual, Paradise, MT - #158)

### **PC #: 351**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should not propose anymore Wilderness.**

Sample Statement:

I am not real familiar with the Forest Service codes, but in general the Sheep Mountain area should not become an MA12, a proposed wilderness. No more wilderness! Leave it as an MA11, roadless area. (Individual, Superior, MT - #426)

Sample Statement:

Recommended Wilderness- do have strong concerns about the proposal to designate the Jewel Basin Hiking Area as Wilderness This area was established under Regulation U-3 in the early 1970s to meet a perceived need for easily accessible hiking country free of conflict with stock and/or motor vehicles It was designed as a recreation area which could be managed so as to accommodate both day recreation and overnight camping m a roadless setting Facilities not allowed in Wildernesses were to be installed and active (hands on) management of fish would be permitted. This is one area where food storage structures would be acceptable and appropriate. Supervisor Ed Brannen and his crew saw this as a place that was already off limits to timber harvest and could be added to the proposed Wilderness category without any objection and perhaps improve public acceptance to the new Forest Plan I thought it was a, mistake then and still, do today! Why do it? If Some folks want it done because they do not trust the Forest Service to keep it like it is then propose legal designation as "National Recreation Area" like the Rattlesnake? (Individual, Missoula, MT - #513)

Sample Statement:

Set aside acreage has increased to the maximum amount needed to sustain wildlife, water quality and special interest ambiance requirements. Logging is an industry that the forest not only can sustain, but is a necessity to ensure a future generation's ownership of the forest and its use. (Individual, Kalispell, MT - #36)

Subconcern:

### **BECAUSE AREAS OUTSIDE THE WILDERNESS SHOULD BE MANAGED FOR MULTIPLE-USE**

Sample Statement:

As a constant user of the National Forest for recreation, hunting, and just enjoyment, I would like to keep the Forest Management open for all of us to use. We have our Wilderness Boundaries and I feel that they are adequate. We must use all the areas outside of these current Wilderness Boundaries for multiple use. There are many resources that are available in these multiple use areas that need to be used. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #813)

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

Sample Statement:

The areas outside the wilderness boundaries must be MANAGED for multiple use needs. This will provide stable resources to the local economy and recreational needs to all who use the forest. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #818)

Sample Statement:

2. The Organic Act established our National Forests for the express purpose of having a sustained or continued flow of water and timber. The Multiple Use, Sustained Yield Act and the National Forest Management Act require sustainability of the multiple uses. Neither these acts, nor any subsequent acts, require any other of the multiple uses to be dominant over the expressed purpose for which the National Forests were established. (Individual, Paradise, MT - #42)

Sample Statement:

The evaluation and decision-making must take into account that the total area of the Bitterroot, Flathead, and Lolo National Forest equals 6,016,000 acres and out of that total 2,161,000 acres or 36% is designated wilderness and the remaining 3,855,000 acres or 64% are intended for multiple-uses and every multiple-use acre must remain available for multiple-uses in order to meet the needs of 97.45% of the public and maintain a reasonable balance of opportunities. (Recreational, Helena, MT - #339)

### **PC #: 347**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow winter motorized use in unroaded areas**

Sample Statement:

Open all MA11 areas to snowmobiles in the name of common sense. I have yet to hear of a dead wolverine because of a snowmobile. These animals are disturbed more from people on foot near their dens...Biologists. (Individual, Clinton, MT - #34)

Sample Statement:

Winter Sports Inc is requesting the new properties through land swap with USFS located in T32N, R22W, Sections 24 & 23 to be designated M.A. 20. (Special Use Permittee, Whitefish, MT - #193)

Sample Statement:

After long discussion, the group proposes to adopt Mike Gullette's map regarding the boundaries of the current MA11's and 12's. The yellow shaded areas shall be MA category 1 to be called "Backcountry Recreation Non-motorized". The pink shaded areas shall be MA category 2 to be called "Backcountry Recreation with Winter Motorized Use". All shaded areas on the map that fall in the Wildland Urban Interface shall be included in the MA category 5...The buffer shall be 1/2 mile on any road. (Place Based Groups, No Address - #822)

### **PC #: 346**

#### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage unroaded areas for non-motorized and non-mechanical use.**

Sample Statement:

I would also like to see approval of the wildland restoration areas included in the NREPA. These areas would help re-establish critical biological linkage corridors for wildlife. (Individual, Bigfork, MT - #471)

Sample Statement:

We also recommend that the following areas remain non-motorized and non-mechanized: 1. Wilderness Study Areas. 2. Roadless Area Review and Evaluation RARE areas identified in LRMP Appendix C road less inventories. 3. Inventoried Roadless Areas. 4. Unroaded, those areas not currently inventoried that have the potential to be placed in category 1 or 2 above. 5. Areas 6 and 10 as found on the Travel management Areas- Bitterroot Plan Revision (map) 2/23/04. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #230)

Sample Statement:

Over the last several years the Montana Chapter has identified, mapped and surveyed unroaded areas larger than a thousand acres outside of inventoried roadless areas. We seek special management standards for several of these areas. Some that are contiguous to IRAs like the Great Burn are appropriate for management under the MA 12 standards of the 1986 Lolo National Forest Plan. Others that are non-contiguous are suitable for management under standards like MA 11 in the 1986 LNF Plan. Still others are suitable for management Under new standards that protect their value as wildlife or fisheries habitat reduce sources of degradation of water bodies, that provide areas of functional connectivity for natural processes, elements and functions or that protect or enhance opportunities for quiet recreation. A map of these areas will be forthcoming shortly. We are quite willing to discuss with you and/or your staff our vision for these places. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #240)

Sample Statement:

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

Keep the unroaded lands wild. Protect wildlife, habitat, and water quality, and pay special attention to threatened species. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #651)

Sample Statement:

As with Glacier National Park to the east of the river, the North Fork on the west side of the river should be managed as "rustic" or "primitive" to maintain a buffer and provide continuity with Glacier's management plan. (Individual, Columbia Falls, MT - #626)

## **Section: Heritage and Cultural Resource Management**

**PC #: 354**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect as well as allow access to traditional heritage resources.**

Sample Statement:

We are concerned about the preservation of historic mines, cabins, settlements, railroads, access routes and other features used by pioneers, homesteaders, loggers, settlers, and miners. These are important cultural resources and should not be removed from the landscape. Western culture and heritage has been characterized by opportunities to work with the land and preservation of all remnants of this culture and heritage is important. Current management practices are not adequately protecting western culture and heritage including the opportunity to work with the land. We request that the ties to the land that are part of our local western culture and heritage be protected and that the preferred travel management alternative include opportunities to visit these features as part of motorized interpretative spur destinations and loops. (Recreational, Helena, MT - #339)

Sample Statement:

Heritage resources do not seem to be getting the level of attention they need in the plan revision. (State Agency or Official, Helena, MT - #163)

Sample Statement:

Heritage Resources: No land shall be placed into (1) World Heritage Site classifications or (2) Biosphere Reserves. This is not to be confused with archeologically important artifacts or "culture" found on the forest, and such things as geologically important landforms must certainly be noted and appropriately conserved. (Place Based Groups, Paradise, MT - #258)

Sample Statement:

Traditional and historic use of public lands must be preserved. The types of trails (roads) necessary for ATV use and the nature of the use substantially and permanently change the character of the resource. Without adequate safeguards, the traditional and historic nature and uses of our public lands will disappear forever. (Individual, Bigfork, MT - #350)

## **Section: National Forest and Private Land Interface**

**PC #: 344**

**Public Concern: The FS should delineate and define a National Forest Private Land Interface which includes values at risk.**

Sample Statement:

We urge that the Wildland Urban Interface be narrowly defined and that fuels reduction projects be focused there instead of in the backcountry. (Preservation/Conservation, Kalispell, MT - #544)

Sample Statement:

Actions NF-F1-A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, F2-A1 We agree that threatened endangered and sensitive species habitat and safety, homes and watersheds should be considered by the forests. We are worried about the proposal to emphasize social and economic needs over ecological components in the "interface zone". How are you defining the "interface zone"? Social and economic needs can be accommodated, but there is no need or justification for emphasizing them at the expense of the ecology, which can still be very important in interface zones. (Preservation/Conservation, Missoula, MT - #566)

Sample Statement:

Action NF-F1-A Looks okay. Carol wants to be sure that when considering values at risk, the dollar value of homes not be the sole consideration in determining their value. Ability to replace and other factors should be considered. fought/controlled on nearby private lands. (Place Based Groups, Kalispell, MT - #828)

Sample Statement:

How far the interface extends. In the case of a big wind, with the right conditions, fire travels a long way...Dave said the

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

interface will vary from place to place. Contiguous fuels is the problem. You need to get the fuel down on the ground. He would rather see a fire mosaic than one big swath. Regarding the desired future condition--do we desire black sticks for miles? You can intervene at any stage in the process. (Place Based Groups, Kalispell, MT - #828)

Subconcern:

### **BECAUSE OF THE POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON WILDLIFE, HABITAT, AND LINKAGE ZONES.**

Sample Statement:

Actions NF-FI-A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, F2-A Much of what may be considered "interface zone" may also be part of a linkage zone, which takes precedence? We endorse promoting open space. We would hope that any action to concentrate fuel management activities would keep in mind the potential impacts on wildlife and habitat, and set standards to that large, fire resistant trees are retained since their removal will increase the potential for fire. (Preservation/Conservation, Missoula, MT - #566)

Sample Statement:

Action NF-F1-A1 Consider adding wording on linkage zone (Place Based Groups, No Address - #822)

Sample Statement:

Comments 1 and 2 continued: If there's an area with heavy fuels, next to an area that doesn't, then consider other issues, i.e., wildlife, watershed...and balance out. There has to be a standard to make a decision. (Place Based Groups, Missoula, MT - #826)

Sample Statement:

The primary goal of management in the WUI should be the protection of lives, homes, businesses, essential infrastructure (e.g., escape routes, municipal water supply structures, and major power and communication lines), with appropriate consideration for other community values at risk from wildfire. "Other" values may include critical wildlife habitat; important recreation and scenic areas; and landscapes of historical, economic, or cultural significance. (Place Based Groups, No Address - #959)

Subconcern:

### **BECAUSE THE DEFINITION AND DELINEATION SHOULD INCLUDE THE PUBLIC AND OTHER**

Sample Statement:

We would hope that any plans to improve recreational facilities and address infrastructure needs would incorporate a public process. (Preservation/Conservation, Missoula, MT - #566)

Sample Statement:

Public private lands interface depends on landowners, we can reduce fuels. The FS needs a way to develop a dialogue with the property owners. Fire Plan dollars are coming and it will determine what we do. Propose to work cooperatively with other entities, need to be more proactive. People aren't aware of programs and wonder what the FS is doing with the lack of work on FS lands. (Place Based Groups, Missoula, MT - #826)

Sample Statement:

Key points from the March 8th Meeting: Education of all landowners Be proactive - work with local government and other landowners and other entities Boundary should vary by forest type, etc. for fuels and would also vary by resource Prioritize work. Need/want to know more about science Cohen, Henry, Fiedler. Consider other objectives - know the difference clearly communicate insect and disease, restoration forestry, ladder fuels, crown fires. Treatments should be specific, fit the land no size fits all. (Place Based Groups, Missoula, MT - #826)

Sample Statement:

...we should get the fire chiefs and county emergency services people involved...because we don't want to get crosswise with the planning they will be doing to develop the Community wildfire Protection Plans called for under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act...we can help define areas where a stewardship approach should be applied. we would not be looking just at hazardous fuels reduction, but other elements in the interface (wildlife, water, etc.), and would be looking at long-term management strategies. They should be compatible with what's happening on "the other side of the fence," on private and state lands. Public and private need to work together. (Place Based Groups, Kalispell, MT - #828)

Subconcern:

### **BECAUSE THE DEFINITION AND DELINEATION SHOULD INCLUDE SCENERY.**

Sample Statement:

What represents the urban interface may differ from person to person. It is not necessarily just the Forest Service land adjacent to private land, but could be anything that is visible in the community. The Forest Service does not have the money to manage every area that everyone can see, but should manage the Forest Service land that is a reasonable distance from private land. Budget will dictate what gets done. Scenery should be considered a value at risk in the context of the interface. The group discussed how difficult it is to draw a line of the urban interface boundary because it will vary from area to area, and may change depending on the weather. What is the Forest Service's definition of Wildland Urban Interface - is it the Western Governors definition? Does density of homes factor into the definition of WUI? Sue will bring copies of the Western Governors definition of WUI to the next meeting. (Place Based Groups, Hamilton, MT - #827)

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

Sample Statement:

Action NF-F1-A1: Listed values at risk should include solitude, quiet and view sheds. (Individual, Columbia Falls, MT - #534)

**PC #: 365**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use historic range of variation to set management direction.**

Sample Statement:

Fuel reduction in the WUI should be designed and implemented to modify expected fire behavior with regard to existing forest types, structure and condition, and should include continued maintenance after initial treatments. For that purpose, it is at times necessary to modify and maintain forest stand structures, species composition and stand density parameters that are artificial with respect to existing and historic stand structures and their natural fire regimes. Preference for retention should be given to larch and ponderosa pine (depending upon habitat type) and hardwood species, with non-preferred species being grand fir, alpine fir, spruce, and others having crowns to the ground. (Place Based Groups, No Address - #959)

**PC #: 353**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage vegetation in the NFPLI for multiple benefits.**

Sample Statement:

NF-F2 As we have seen with Threatened and Endangered species, single species management rarely works. Do not fall into the trap of single objective management with fuels management. A more integrated approach to land management can meet multiple objectives rather than promoting user conflicts that would occur in single objective management. Vegetation management within this urban interface needs to focus on providing a generally healthy forest structure. This will provide multiple benefits, including reduced wildfire risk, wildlife habitat and recreational opportunities. Review some of the research completed by Keegan et. al. regarding the economic and effectiveness benefits of a comprehensive stand treatment compared to traditional understory fuels treatment. (Individual, Trego, MT - #213)

Sample Statement:

Action NF-F2-A1: Fuel management needs will differ between ecosystems, even within the interface. In some areas, old growth forests are less likely to burn than a treated thinned forest. (Individual, Columbia Falls, MT - #534)

Sample Statement:

Action NF-F2-A1 Prioritization of Forest Revision activities will be done in highly populated areas, municipal watersheds and power line corridors. [A minimum of] 5% of interface should be treated [annually]. Fuel reduction will be the focus on public land in the wildland urban interface up to 1 1/2 miles from the boundary of private and state trust land...Exception: if private landowner adjacent to [IRA] is treating his/her land, Forest Service would reciprocate with like treatment... (Place Based Groups, No Address - #822)

Sample Statement:

Management of the interface and of forest products go together. We should address them together. Reducing fuel loads in the WUI is the direction. (Place Based Groups, Kalispell, MT - #828)

Sample Statement:

Thinning can be a tool for getting there. We expect to see higher use and greater impacts within the interface area. We should manage for fire protection, with consideration for watershed values. We should favor policies that tend to reduce hazardous fuel accumulations. Don't overlook the community fire plan. Vegetation management (logging, thinning) should receive highest priority. Areas with highest values at risk (often homes), and where we know there will be cooperation among adjoining landowners (private, Forest Service, other agencies) should be given top priority. Our focus should be on "enhancement" of forest conditions. Make it useable, bring it back to its former state. (Place Based Groups, Darby, MT - #829)

Subconcern:

### **BECAUSE NFPLI IS SUITABLE FOR TIMBER PRODUCTION**

Sample Statement:

Action FP-F1-A3 We propose to include the National Forest and private land interface near human development as suitable timber lands. (Place Based Groups, No Address - #822)

Sample Statement:

The private land interface should generally be kept in the timber base, as much of this land is well suited for timber production, and frequent management is planned. While it is difficult to estimate annual volumes from such areas, there are ways to make reasonable estimates. I will be willing to meet with you to discuss such methods at an appropriate time. (Preservation/Conservation, Stevensville, MT - #612)

Sample Statement:

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

Part of the WUI perhaps could be in the timber base. Other WUI areas might be harvested for various reason, but not meet the restocking requirements that exist for "suitable timber lands" management--because, for instance, of the need to keep fuels reduced. (Place Based Groups, Kalispell, MT - #828)

Sample Statement:

While the WUI should be included in the timber base, the primary WUI management objective should be fire defensibility, not timber production to maximum potential. Well spaced larger trees should be retained, often past their optimum growth period. Regeneration of WUI-compatible species should occur, but not at the levels normally planned in areas managed for timber. Some modification of existing (or subsequently enacted) standards set under the National Forest Management Act of 1976 may be necessary in the WUI to authorize necessary forest structure modification and fuel reduction treatments. For example, modifications such as suspending or lessening the reforestation, stocking and regeneration requirements for Suitable Timberlands in the WUI may be needed. (Place Based Groups, No Address - #959)

Subconcern:

### **BECAUSE IT IS GOOD FOR ECONOMICS**

Sample Statement:

Any wood products generated as a result of fuel reduction treatments should be made available for commercial use. Commercial use of previously underutilized wood products and waste materials should be encouraged and investment in new utilization processes should be fostered. A variety of contracting opportunities should be made available to attract diverse investment in labor, equipment and manufacturing infrastructure to carry out hazardous fuels reduction work and to maintain desirable WUI ecosystem conditions over time. (Place Based Groups, No Address - #959)

Sample Statement:

Action NF-F2-A1: We encourage the removal and utilization of fuel rather than burning to help the local economy." (Place Based Groups, No Address - #825)

Sample Statement:

...fuels issue in the WUI: When developers go to the county with their plans there could be a stipulation that they need to help fund fuel reduction if they are building in the urban interface area...the recommendation means fuel reduction on that same private property, not elsewhere. The County could not require a landowner to perform work on adjacent federal land. o Why don't insurance companies just deny coverage to people building close to fuels? Some of this is happening. There is a law that property owners have to take care of their weeds or they are fined dramatically (county takes care of weeds and then sends the bill to the landowners - tax lien on the property) Could you do this to your neighbor for not thinning his trees? Concern was expressed about how much the F.S. pays to help protect structures during fires. Would rather see the money spent on preventative work than on fire suppression (Agreement)o Both the landowner and the FS need to share the responsibility for it to work. (Agreement) (Place Based Groups, Hamilton, MT - #827)

Subconcern:

### **BECAUSE OF INVASIVE PLANT SPECIES.**

Sample Statement:

After discussion, the group agreed to the wording, "aggressively manage with the goal to eradicate." (Place Based Groups, No Address - #825)

Sample Statement:

Action NF-F3-A1(We propose to manage and treat invasive plant species using integrated pest management concepts due to the high potential for introduction and spread.)--Looks okay. It was noted the need to work in cooperation with county weed departments. One reason invasive weeds spread into federal lands is because they are not fought/controlled on nearby private lands. It was said in some cases people complain they are fighting weeds on their properties, but the Forest Service is not doing the same thing on its side of the line. Public and private need to work together. (Place Based Groups, Kalispell, MT - #828)

## **PC #: 355**

### **Public Concern: The Forest Service should not manage lands in the NFPLI to protect adjacent lands.**

Sample Statement:

It is asinine to cut the forests to protect a house built two miles away, when you people say the only way to protect property is to do the thinning on your own property to protect your house, 'this coupled with using fire retardant materials in the house construction. (Individual, Corvallis, MT - #40)

Sample Statement:

I'd like to be on record expressing concern on how much the forest service pays to help protect structures during fires. I would rather see these funds spent on preventative work than on fire suppression. firmly believe that if a land owner chooses to build a structure in a WUI with high fuel hazards then they must be held accountable for fire damages or

suppression expenses. (Place Based Groups, Victor, MT - #560)

**PC #: 32**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should encourage flexibility in the management of the National Forest and Private Land Interface area to allow for community plans, current and evolving social trends, as well as ecological components.**

Sample Statement:

A lot of folks are getting involved in the various collaborative groups who haven't participated in the forest management discussion before. Looking at a single "desired condition" for such large areas as those covered by the "forest products" and "federal/private lands interface" designations may not be desirable. We want to encourage flexibility, not have a one-size-fits-all prescription. For the WUI, we can say we want the government to manage areas to reduce the risk to some degree. As a specific example, "We want to stop a running crown fire when the humidity is X% and the wind is blowing X miles per hour..." We can't prevent all fires. How much fuel has to be reduced and what is the structural layout that will help achieve the goal? What would happen if the experts said cut all the trees around the house. We have to say what level of risk is acceptable....We need neighborhood rules and regulations so that people will do something about their own properties. Maybe the insurance companies should take a role in this effort. ... asked if a standard wouldn't have to be measurable. If the goal is to reduce the fire hazard, you have to address how to reduce the risk--like trying to prevent running crown fires....If the humidity was high, you could let a ground fire burn....said he had heard a DNRC presentation where Pat Cross said the agency would knock fires down as soon as it could. But that will just keep the fuel load up. said you would need to do thinning and prescribed burning. (Place Based Groups, Kalispell, MT - #828)

Sample Statement:

What management direction is needed to address the social and ecological components unique to the Forest and Private Land Interface? Interface areas would be different, for fuels, it may be more narrow than for recreation. Management areas may be wide or narrow in scope. What will the Forests look like in 2025? How do we make our management plans flexible enough so we don't have to amend Forest Plans? Planning areas may be zoned. The language on fire and fuels could be more specific, it needs to be more clear in terms of what kind of fuels treatment is most appropriate. Public private lands interface depends on landowners, we can reduce fuels. The FS needs a way to develop a dialogue with the property owners. FS has applied for fire grants (Grant Creek treated 200 acres). Removed 17 loads of hog fuel. Our approach is to do what's available to us and we are limited in what we can do on private lands. Fire Plan dollars are coming and it will determine what we do. Currently have a grant with Granite Conservation District for fuel removal up and down Rock Creek. Community Fire Plans. What is the FS going to do? There's a lot of private work but what is the FS doing? Just completed a project in Ninemile. Proposed Action is reactive. Proactive elements are missing with the Proposed Action. Land that's being developed, would like to see the FS work with developers on private land development. Propose to work cooperatively with other entities, need to be more proactive. In ID all counties they have county fire plan mapped, in MT some have, others don't. People aren't aware of programs and wonder what the FS is doing with the lack of work on FS lands. In Seeley, FS is very aggressive, not everyone understood what fuels reduction was and when it was done, where we live it looked more like a clear cut. We expected to really benefit from it. It wasn't what we expected. (Place Based Groups, Missoula, MT - #826)

Sample Statement:

Plans as written don't help in this area as they should. Missoula area is best addressed in the current Forest Plan. We now need to deal with recreation, fire and fuel issues, etc. (Place Based Groups, Missoula, MT - #826)

Sample Statement:

The direction on management within urban interface areas must be clearly stated in the final draft to reflect current state of the art prescriptions that are effective in affecting fire behavior (i.e. Fiedler, Keegan, Covington). Also, the overriding influence community fire plans will have on the zoning effort in forest plans must be clearly stated and made clear to the public. Included in such clarification should be a built-in adaptive management or flexibility that allows the Forest Service to react to community fire plan modifications in a timely way. (Timber or Wood Products Industry, Seeley Lake, MT - #629)

**PC #: 33**

**Public Concern: The Forest Service should not emphasize social and economic values in the National Forest and Private Land Interface.**

Sample Statement:

In addition, managing low-elevation forest lands for "socio-economic" needs is totally neglecting the most important wildlife habitat. Not to mention the most accessible forest lands for communities. Quiet hiking and horseback riding, traditional uses should be maintained in these areas. (Individual, West Glacier, MT - #623)

Sample Statement:

## *WMPZ Forest Plan Revision Scoping Phase Content Analysis Report*

Action NF-F2-A1 (We propose to concentrate fuels management activities in the interface near areas of moderate and high hazard to wildfire. Live and dead fuels would be managed to reduce likelihood of high-intensity wildland fire threatening values at risk and firefighter safety). The forests should establish a goal to work with counties - and provide appropriate incentives such as telling them fire suppression in the interface isn't always going to be a top spending priority in enacting planning tools that discourage inordinate private development in fire-prone areas. (Preservation/Conservation, Missoula, MT - #488)

Sample Statement:

Action EM-F4-A2: (We propose to allow treatments of old growth stands to maintain or restore old growth conditions and reduce threats from disturbances such as insects, disease, wind and fire.)In the past centuries, Native Americans had great influence over forest and range vegetative conditions, especially in the lower elevation areas where they lived, hunted, and traveled. It will be difficult to ascertain what conditions existed throughout our forests more than 200 years ago. If it is deemed desirable to maintain forests in the 200 plus age class, insect and disease mortality will be high. Thus fuel buildup will be greater than desirable. (Place Based Groups, Paradise, MT - #258)